DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 298 TE 001 501

By-Davis, A. L., Ed.
American Dialects for English Teachers. Interim Report.
Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary English Teachers (ISCPET), Urbana.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-5-0789
Pub Date May 69
Contract-OEC-5-10-029
Note-110p.
Available from-A. L. Davis, Center for American English, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill. 60616 (free or on loan)
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC Not Available from EDRS.
Descriptors-*American English, Diachronic Linguistics, *Dialects, Dialect Studies, *Disadvantaged Youth, *English Instruction, Grammar, Inservice Teacher Education, Language, Language Usage, Nonstandard Dialects, Regional Dialects, Social Dialects, *Teacher Education, Teaching Methods
Identifiers-Project English

This report is designed to aid the college instructor preparing prospective English teachers in the area of dialect studies. It includes a general description of the nature of dialect, teaching suggestions, and an extensive annotated bibliography. The articles which make up the report are as follows: "Historical, Regional and Social Variation" by Raven I. McDavid, Jr.; "The Study of Dialects" by N. Louanna Furbee; "Suggestions for Teaching American Dialects" by A. L. Davis; "Problem Areas in Grammar" by William Card and Virginia Glenn McDavid; "Speech Samples of Disadvantaged Children" by N. Louanna Furbee, Emily Pettigrew Norris, and Dagna Simpson; "Abbreviated Checklist of Lexical Items in Dialects" by A. L. Davis; and "A Checklist of Significant Features for Discriminating Social Dialects" by Raven I. McDavid, Jr. (Author)

ED032298

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INTERIM REPORT

USOE Project Number HE-145
USOE Contract Number OE-5-10-029
ISCPET Subcontract Number SS-12-32-67

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER
IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL
ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

American Dialects for English Teachers

Edited by
A. L. Davis
Center for American English
Illinois Institute of Technology
Chicago, Illinois 60616

May 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to a subcontract with the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. Contractors and subcontractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the projects. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TE 001 501

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

Director: J. N. Hook
Associate Director: Paul H. Jacobs
Research Associate: Raymond D. Crisp

Project Headquarters:
1210 West California
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Raymond D. Crisp, University of Illinois, non-voting member
William H. Evans, Southern Illinois University, past member
John S. Gerrietts, Loyola University, past member and Chairman
John M. Heissler, Illinois State University, past Chairman
J. N. Hook, University of Illinois
Paul H. Jacobs, University of Illinois
Alfred L. Papillon, DePaul University, Chairman
Justus R. Pearson, Illinois Wesleyan University, past member and Chairman
Roy K. Weshinskey, Southern Illinois University, past Chairman

COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS AND PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVES

Aurora College - Roy L. Crews and Ethel W. Tapper
Bradley University - W. F. Elwood and Paul Sawyer
DePaul University - Margaret M. Neville and Alfred L. Papillon
Greenville College - I. D. Baker and Donald Pennington
Illinois Institute of Technology - A. L. Davis and Henry C. Knepler
Illinois State University - Victor E. Gimmestad and John M. Heissler
Illinois Wesleyan University - Justus R. Pearson and Clifford Pfeltz
Knox College - Michael G. Crowell and Carl Eisemann
Loyola University - James Barry and Sister Mary Constantine
Monmouth College - Grace Boswell and Ben T. Shawver
North Central College - Richard M. Eastman and Erling Peterson
Northwestern University - Sidney Bergquist and Wallace Douglas
Olivet Nazarene College - Fordyce Bennett and Vernon T. Groves
Rockford College - William D. Baker and Ronald Podeschi
Roosevelt University - William Leppert and William Makely
Saint Xavier College - Thomas Deegan and George K. McGuire
Southern Illinois University - Ellen A. Frogner and Roy K. Weshinskey
University of Chicago - Janet A. Emig and Robert Parker
University of Illinois - J. N. Hook and Paul H. Jacobs
Western Illinois University - Alfred Lindsey, Jr. and Sherman Rush

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Harry S. Broudy, University of Illinois
Dwight L. Burton, Florida State University
Robert Bush, Stanford University
Nelson W. Francis, Brown University
Nathaniel Gage, Stanford University
Alfred H. Grommon, Stanford University
William Riley Parker, Indiana University (Deceased)
Robert C. Pooley, Department of Public Instruction, Wisconsin
Loren Reid, University of Missouri
William Sheldon, Syracuse University
James R. Squire, formerly of the University of Illinois; past Executive Secretary, National Council of Teachers of English

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1
A. L. Davis

HISTORICAL, REGIONAL AND SOCIAL VARIATION 3
Raven I. McDavid, Jr.

THE STUDY OF DIALECTS 13
N. Louanna Furbee

SUGGESTIONS FOR TEACHING AMERICAN DIALECTS 23
A. L. Davis

PROBLEM AREAS IN GRAMMAR 26
William Card and Virginia Glenn McDavid

SPEECH SAMPLES OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN 55
N. Louanna Furbee, Emily Pettigrew Norris, Dagna Simpson

ABBREVIATED CHECKLIST OF LEXICAL ITEMS IN DIALECTS 57
A. L. Davis

A CHECKLIST OF SIGNIFICANT FEATURES FOR DISCRIMINATING SOCIAL DIALECTS . 62
Raven I. McDavid, Jr.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY 67

- American English Dialects 68
- Animal Behavior and "Language" 73
- Bibliographies 74
- Computational Linguistics 77
- Educating the Disadvantaged 78
- English Linguistics (General) 81
- General Linguistics 85
- Glossaries 90
- Linguistics and the Teaching of English 90
- Paralanguage and Non-Verbal Communication 93
- Psycholinguistics and Sociolinguistics 95
- Research in Progress 97
- Selected Articles from Language Learning 99
- Teaching English as a Foreign Language 100
- Using the Language Laboratory 106

William M. Austin, Lawrence M. Davis, N. Louanna Furbee,
Emmett Lally, Emily Pettigrew Norris, Joseph Roy, Dagna Simpson

INTRODUCTION

The preparation for English teachers recommended by the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers (ISCPET)[1] shows many areas where the background of prospective and of practicing teachers needs improvement. There has been relatively little preparation in dialectology and sociolinguistics because teaching materials have not been readily available. In large part, the field has been left to specialists who in institutes, seminars, workshops, general lectures at professional meetings and in papers published in professional journals, have given brief sketches of the kind of work they are doing.

This report is an attempt to fill this gap. As a part of the Illinois Institute of Technology's participation in ISCPET, two Special Research Studies were conducted. One collected taped speech samples of standard English used in the United States and Canada, and another study developed a syllabus for a course in dialectology. This study also attempted to prepare and assemble material which could be used with that syllabus or in any course devoted to the study of dialectology or language. There is not enough material here for a complete semester's work in dialectology, of course. It would be superfluous to prepare such a syllabus because it would have to be taught by a specialist who would prepare his own course following his own research. Instead we have hoped to provide the non-specialist college teacher with enough material so that he will be able to devote a part of his course in the English language or in methods of teaching English to a consideration of dialect problems.

In addition, the course syllabus and the related materials are directed to experienced high school English teachers. We hope that this report can be a useful aid in in-service education programs as well as an aid to teaching dialects, about dialects, and about language.

The report begins with an article by Raven I. McDavid, Jr., which was originally prepared as a part of a non-ISCPET USOE project under the title of _Language Resource Information for Teachers of the Culturally Disadvantaged_ (USOE 6-1340;OE-3-7-061340 April, 1969) and under my general direction; Mr. McDavid's article, "Historical, Regional, and Social Variation," is placed in the introductory portion of this report because of the background information on dialects which it can give the reader. The substance of this article was first published in the March, 1967 issue of _Journal of English Linguistics_. However, it is reprinted here, with the permission of Mr. McDavid and Mr. Robert Peters, editor of _JEL_, because of its revisions and its applicability.

---

[1] J. N. Hook, "Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers of English: A Preliminary Statement," _College English_, 27, (November, 1965), pp. 166-9.

N. Louanna Furbee's article, "The Study of Dialects," gives a helpful transition from Mr. McDavid's wide and general view of dialects to some of the specifics outlined in the suggested course syllabus, "Suggestions for Teaching American Dialects."

Much of William Card's and Virginia Glenn McDavid's article, "Problem Areas in Grammar," can be used as illustrative material for the course in dialectology. The same is true for the "Speech Samples of Disadvantaged Children." These two articles, in companion, can be used as well by practicing English teachers who wish to teach about language and dialect and by teachers who are faced in reality with the described problems. "Problem Areas in Grammar" was also a part of Language Resource and is reprinted here by permission of the authors.

The two closing articles are checklists of lexical items and significant features of social dialects, one prepared by Mr. McDavid and one by myself. Mr. McDavid's "A Checklist of Significant Features for Discriminating Social Dialects" is another article borrowed from Language Resource. This checklist has also been published in Dimensions of Dialects, edited by Eldonna L. Evertts in 1967 for the National Council of Teachers of English, but is included in this report because it lends completeness to the other checklist and is reprinted by permission of the NCTE.

The final section of this report is an Annotated Bibliography on various areas within linguistics. The Bibliography is extensive but not exhaustive, and it is offered as a helpful adjunct to the course syllabus and as a guide to teaching and studying. Some of the books may be considered necessary for outside reading or for library additions. Highly recommended for classroom use and reference are the NCTE publications: On the Dialects of Children, Social Dialects and Language Learning, and Roger Shuy's Discovering American Dialects; also Carroll Reed's Dialects of American English, Hans Kurath's and Raven McDavid's Pronunciation of English in the Atlantic States, Kurath's A Word Geography of the Eastern United States. E. Bagby Atwood's Survey of Verb Forms in the Eastern United States. Language Resource Information for Teachers of the Culturally Disadvantaged contains additional supplementary information.

Copies of any or all of the tapes which were prepared and/or collected by the two ISCPET-IIT Special Research Studies are available at cost from me.

A. L. Davis

April 24, 1969
Chicago, Illinois

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED
MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Jrnl. of English Linguistics & McDavid
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER
AGREEMENTS WITH THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION.
FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM
REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

HISTORICAL, REGIONAL, AND SOCIAL VARIATION (1)

Raven I. McDavid, Jr.

What James H. Sledd has called the "agonizing deappraisal" of *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, since its appearance in 1961, has shown that many Americans, in keeping with the national trend to simplistic interpretations, would make a sharp dichotomy between "good language" and "bad language," or between what is "correct" and what is "incorrect." In this same dichotomizing, the villains of the piece are often the linguists, who are accused of advocating "say as you go" attitudes in language practice and of "letting down the bars" where standards are concerned. Though it is perhaps no help to a linguist or lexicographer who has been clawed by an angry journalist or literary critic, the fact is that no responsible linguist has denied the existence of standards, or refused to recognize that in any speech community some people are acknowledged as using the language better--that is, in a fashion more worthy of emulation--than others.

There is not in language--or in any other form of human behavior--a simple opposition between good and bad, but a complicated set of interrelated variations; it is necessary for linguists themselves to sort out the many dimensions in which usage may vary and show how these variations are related to each other. This has been done in the past by several scholars; but as a way of introducing this topic it is well to repeat their findings. (2)

Among the scales on which a given detail of usage may be measured, the following have been suggested; others may of course be devised or discovered.

1. The dimension of the medium--essentially writing as opposed to speech. There is little chance to use *antidisestablishmentarianism* in conversation, let alone the sesquipedalian terms of organic chemistry. Only in homely fiction (and the authorship of such a distinguished writer as William Faulkner does not refute the homeliness) is there a place for such a term as *fice*, "a small, noisy, generally worthless dog of uncertain ancestry."

2. The dimension of responsibility, as Joos puts it--an understanding of the normal social expectations of the audience in particular or of the community at large. A politician who talks over the heads of his audience may be admired for his cleverness or even brilliance, but will usually be denied the votes he is seeking. Some people--like myself--cannot read Henry James: he is too consciously superior in his style, which begins to seem a set of mannerisms after half a dozen pages. And it has been attested in a variety of situations that a person who is too meticulous in his observation of grammatical shibboleths and in avoiding the speech of his locality may rouse the distrust of his fellows. (3) On the other hand, a complete disregard of these expectations may be equally disastrous. The novelty of the "Beat" writers, free association with a minimum of revision, soon ran its course, except for the most case-hardened cultists: the reading public became impatient. (4)

3. The dimension of maturity--the notion that one should speak as well as act one's chronological age. The sight of a plump Hausfrau in a bikini is no more distressing than

the sound of a middle-aged parent trying to keep up with the latest adolescent slang. Even finer distinctions are apparent: college students scorn the kind of language that had delighted them in high school.

4. The scale of vogue. On one hand, this is found in the slang of the year; on another in certain kinds of jargon and counter-words. Both varieties of vogue language are exceedingly difficult to pin down; most of the time the vogue has passed before the lexicographers have settled down to recording and classifying.

5. The scale of association--the argot or technical language of a group with which one has become identified. Every association group has this--not just teen-age gangs and the more formally parasitic subcultures of the underworld. The language of a stamp-collector or a model railroad fan on the one hand, of Anglo-Catholic clergy or Chicago critics on the other, may be just as unintelligible to outsiders not of the true bond as is the lingo of safe-crackers or narcotic addicts.

6. The scale of relationship between the speaker or writer and his audience--the "Five Clocks" of Martin Joos. In the center, as Joos reckons it, is the *consultative* style, of the small committee or social gathering--not more than six people--where free interchange is possible but background information must be supplied. On the one side are the *formal* style, typified in public address, and the *frozen* style, that of great literature (encompassing principally but not exclusively the "high style" or the "sublime" of traditional criticism)--where the public insists on the text being repeated intact. On the other are the *casual* style, where familiarity of speaker and audience with each other eliminates the need for background information, and the *intimate*, where close association makes possible many syntactic shortcuts. It is noticeable that the frozen and the intimate styles, as opposite poles, share the feature of high allusiveness, created in one by the genius of the author at compressing much into a small space and in the other by the closeness of association.

7. The dimension of history, paralleling, to some extent, the scale of maturity in the individual. Dictionaries have long recognized this dimension: words or senses that have not been observed for some centuries are labeled *obsolete*; those that have appeared only rarely in some centuries, and not at all for a few generations, are marked *archaic*. A more troublesome class is made up of those words and meanings which are still encountered, but only in the usage of the older and less sophisticated--those that I would call *old-fashioned*; so far, there is no traditional label in lexicography, though everybody recognizes the items. Even more troublesome are innovations, which are seldom if ever marked, since by the time they are noticed they have generally become well established. A notorious example is the verb *to finalize*, which did not arouse the ire of the belles-lettristes (because of its vogue in advertising) until a generation after it had been recorded, and much longer after it first appeared.

8. The regional scale. At one end we have pronunciations, words or meanings that are limited to a small part of the English-speaking world; at the other, things that are truly international in that they are shared by several language communities. *Chay*!, a call to summon cattle, is found in the United States (it may still be heard in Northern Ireland) only in a small section of eastern South Carolina; most of the new terms of science and technology, including such everyday words as *telephone*, are found not only in all places where English is spoken but in other languages as well. Within the English-speaking world, there are words, meanings, pronunciations and even grammatical forms characteristic of England proper, Ireland, Scotland, the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and the West Indies--to say nothing of more local subdivisions in each of these. To take a few examples, a *station* in Australia is the same as a *ranch* in Western North America; a *tickle* in Newfoundland is an inlet; and the *telly* in Britain is the television.

9. The social scale. This means, simply, that some varieties of the language are more esteemed than others. It may be an alien variety of the community language, like British English in parts of the Commonwealth; it may even be an alien language, like French in parts of Africa. In most European countries it is a variety of the language used by the richer and better born and better educated in a focus of national life--economic, cultural, or political--which often turns out to be the area round the capital: Roman-Florentine in

Italy, Castilian in Spain, Parisian in France, Muscovite in Russia, London in England (it should be noted that the lower-class speech of the same areas has no prestige; in fact, as we document with traditional London lower-class speech, Cockney, it may be the least favored of all lower-class regional varieties). The favored dialect of one century, even one generation, may not be that of the next. In extreme cases, another city may replace the older center of prestige, as London replaced Winchester after the Norman Conquest; in all cases the favored dialect will change as new classes rise in the scale and set new fashions of language behavior.

The American situation, however, is different--both in the United States and in Canada. Partly through geography, partly through the independence of each of the early settlements from each other, partly through a stubborn tradition of individualism and local loyalty, no city has unqualified preeminence of the kind that Paris, London and Vienna have in their countries. Each of the older cultural centers--Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Richmond, Charleston--had its own elite and boasted its own kind of excellence; as the nation expanded westward, such new cities as Chicago, San Francisco, Atlanta, Saint Louis and Salt Lake City developed their own prestige in their own areas. There is a good deal of ridicule exchanged between cities, most of it good natured, as to which local pronunciation (for grammar and vocabulary are strikingly uniform among urban educated speakers) is the most outlandish or the most pleasant; but for practical purposes the educated speech of one area is as good as another--and all varieties of uneducated speech are at a disadvantage, especially when the speakers move out of their own areas.

For six of the nine scales of variation, the speaker has some freedom of choice. But for the last three--history, region and society--he is more or less caught up in forces beyond his control. No man can change the generation or place of his birth; his attempts to change the social variety of his speech will be determined by the kind of education he receives and the kind of persons he associates with, and opportunities to make a drastic change are not as common as we would like.

Along all of these scales, for practical purposes, we can expect variation in a number of aspects of human communication. Outside language we have (1) proxemics, the phenomena of spatial variation, including the distances at which communication is effective; (2) haptics, the phenomena of body contact; (3) kinesics, bodily movements in communication, of which gestures are only a small part; (4) paralanguage, the non-linguistic but communicatively significant orchestration of the stream of speech, involving such phenomena as abnormally high or low pitch, abnormally fast or slow tempo, abnormal loudness or softness, drawl, clipping, rasp, openness, and the like. These are all in the earliest stages of discussion; linguists and anthropologists recognize their importance but have just begun to develop systems of notation and means of comparison. (5)

Within the domain of language proper, but having a special position, are the suprasegmentals, the phenomena that in English include stress, intonation, transitions, and terminals of clauses and utterances. It should be noted that suprasegmentals, like the aspects of communication outside the language system, have so far had no systematic comparative discussion regionally or socially. And all these phenomena are attested to only in a limited way historically, and in writing have no direct reflection.

Within language proper there is a system of segmental phonemes, or vowels and consonants, capable of variation in the structure of the system, in the articulation of the individual phonemes, and in their incidence in particular environments. (6) The system of morphology likewise varies in its structure, in the shape of particular morphemes (especially of inflections), and in their incidence in particular environments. There is a system of syntax, involving the selection and arrangement of morphemes. (7) And finally there is the body of meaningful forms--the lexicon--with various words possible for the same meaning, and various meanings possible for the same word.

If we look at the history of English, we can see that all kinds of changes have taken place as the result of various forces, borrowing (both from other languages and from one dialect of English into another), phonetic change, and analogy. (8)

In the pronunciation system, we have kept four of the short vowels of Old English: /I, ɛ, æ, U/; Old English /Y/, however, has unrounded to /I/, so that *fill* and *will* now rhyme. Many of the words which had /U/ in Old English now have /ʌ/, and for most American dialects the low-back rounded vowel /ɔ/, as in *God*, has unrounded to /a/. In contrast to these slight changes, all the long vowels and diphthongs of Old English have changed their phonetic shape, and some of them have fallen together; for example, Middle English /sæ:/, 'body of water,' and /se:/ 'to perceive with the eyes' have fallen together as /si/.

The morphological structure of the language has likewise altered. The noun retains only the general plural and the genitive; the adjective retains comparison (though for many adjectives it is a periphrastic comparison with *more* and *most* instead of the historical inflected comparison with *-er*,*-est*), but has lost all markers of number, gender and case. The pronoun system has been drastically simplified: only the neuter *it* retains the old accusative, here undifferentiated from the nominative; in all other pronouns the old dative has assumed all object functions. In the second person the historical dative plural has not only usurped the functions of the accusative but those of the nominative as well, and (with rare exceptions) has become the standard for the singular in object and subject positions. In the third person, *she*, *they*, *their* and *them*--borrowings from Northern English dialects--have supplanted the older forms. Throughout the pronominal system there has been a differentiation between the attributive genitive, as *my book*, and the absolute, as *a book of mine*. The article and demonstrative are now distinct from each other; the demonstrative has lost all gender and case distinctions, with the historical neuter nominative-accusatives *this* and *that* remaining in the singular and developing new plurals.

The most spectacular morphological changes have taken place in the verb. It is still a two-tense verb, like all Germanic verbs, but many of the older strong or irregular verbs have become weak or regular, and the survivors have tended to level their principal parts: only *was/were* remains of the historical distinction between preterite singular and preterite plural, and for many verbs preterite and past participle have fallen together. Distinctions of person and number have been lost except for the verb *to be* and for the third singular present indicative. The subjunctive mode has been lost except for the hypothetical *if I (he) were you*, the very formal *if this be treason*, a series of petrified formulas, such as *resolved, that this house stand adjourned*, and that-clauses following such verbs as *urge* and *insist*.

Syntactic changes are also numerous. Word order, once flexible and capable of variation, as in classical Latin or contemporary Ojibwa, has now been fixed. New patterns of interrogative and negative structures have developed, with the verb *do* as an auxiliary. And there has been a proliferation of very complicated verb phrases, capable of rendering far more subtle nuances of meaning than could have been rendered in Latin; if some of them rarely occur, as *tomorrow our house will have been being redecorated for two months*, they are comprehensible and acceptable when they occur.

Changes in the vocabulary and in meanings are so numerous and familiar that it is almost useless to mention them; a few examples will suffice. *Starve*, originally meaning 'to perish of hunger'; as a general verb it has been replaced by *die*. The overworked *nice* originally meant *foolish*. *Flesh* has lost its meaning of 'edible muscular tissue,' and has been replaced in this meaning by *meat*, which originally signified anything edible (*sweetmeats* preserves the old meaning); *food* has assumed the general meaning.

To this stage of the presentation we have assumed a more or less linear development, recognizing but disregarding differences within the speech community. Yet we know by experience that no speech community of any size--and the size may be only a few hundred speakers--is without regional and social distinctions. Different communities use the language differently; some speakers are recognized as using it better than others do. The larger the speech community, the more complicated are the relationships between regional and social varieties.

Regional differences may arise in a variety of ways. The classical explanation--which has been used to explain the differences in Modern German, before the new *Wölkerwänderung* after World War II--is that of the original settlement by a group speaking a particular dialect of the same language. The population mixture in all of the early American settlements makes this explanation less cogent here, but such groups have left their traces. We can think of the Ulster Scots in Western Pennsylvania, and less significantly in the Southern uplands and the South Midland derivatives to the west; of the Irish fishermen on Beaver Island in Lake Michigan and in various coves along the Newfoundland coast; of the East Anglian influence, through the early Puritans, on the speech of New England, especially east of the Connecticut River; and in the American Middle West, of the preservation of New England speechways in the Western Reserve around Cleveland and in the Marietta speech-island where the Muskingum flows into the Ohio.

Settlements of speakers of a foreign language also leave their impact on a local dialect. The Palatinate Germans who settled in Eastern Pennsylvania about 1700 have influenced to some degree the English of their area, not only in vocabulary but also in pronunciation, in syntax and in intonation. In similar fashion the Scandinavians in Minneapolis have markedly influenced English intonation; even complete monolinguals cannot escape acquiring the speech-tune of the Swedish-Americans they played with as children. So have the Cajans of southwestern Louisiana influenced the intonation of Louisiana English, and--on all but the most educated level--caused a loss of final consonant clusters and most inflectional endings.

Regional dialects also reflect historical patterns of migration and communication. In Germany the Rhine has disseminated the South German speech forms northward, and vice versa; in the United States the Mississippi has done likewise. In the Middle West, settlers from New England followed the shores of Lake Erie westward and did not cross the swamplands of the Maumee and Kankakee, while settlers from the Upland South moved north along the tributaries of the Ohio, taking up holdings in the bottom-lands; today, despite subsequent industrialization, the speech of Ohio, Indiana and Illinois is split between Yankee and Southern highland. Conversely, even what now seems a trivial geographical barrier could inhibit the spread of settlement and speech: Chesapeake Bay isolated the Delmarva Peninsula from the focal area of the Virginia Tidewater and Piedmont; the Virginia Blue Ridge limited the westward spread of plantation culture, so that the Shenandoah Valley was settled by migration from western Pennsylvania, and in Vermont the crest of the Green Mountains marks the division between Eastern and Western New England speechways.

If a cultural focus exists, its speech forms spread into the surrounding countryside or even leap rural areas to become established in what one could call satellite cities. The prestige of Boston has led to the establishment of its speech as the model for Eastern New England, and as a type to imitate in much of the northern United States; Philadelphia dominates Eastern Pennsylvania and Pittsburgh the western half of the state; the cultivated speech of Richmond and other Virginia Piedmont cities has been emulated not merely in the Shenandoah Valley but in cities of eastern North Carolina and as far west as Charleston, West Virginia. New York seems to be an exception, its vocabulary has spread but not its pronunciation, possibly because the city has for so long boasted very large foreign-language concentrations. (9) Where communities have been geographically or culturally isolated, of course, the opposite is true: the speech of the Maine coast, the Southern Appalachians, or northeastern North Carolina does not spread, and in fact gives way to outside models as these remote areas become accessible.

Political boundaries, old and new, are reflected in Europe as limits of pronunciations or words; they are so recent in the United States, and so ineffective on the movement of people and goods, that they seldom cause linguistic differences--though with purely political terms, such as the Ontario reeve, 'township officer,' linguistic and political limits may coincide. But in an indirect way, as in the quality of a school system, state boundaries may be significant. Folk pronunciations and folk grammatical forms survived much more strongly in Western Maryland and West Virginia than in Pennsylvania, though the early settlers were the same kinds of people and the easy routes of communications cross the state boundaries; but Pennsylvania had an earlier and deeper commitment to public education than the states further south.

By now it is possible to summarize in some detail the kinds of regional differences that appear in American English. In addition to the usual features of grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary, there are probably regional variations in proxemics, haptics, kinesics, paralanguage and suprasegmentals, though no systematic statement is possible. The entomologist Henry K. Townes has noted that some hand gestures seem to occur only in the South Carolina

Piedmont; Southern speech seems to have a wider range of stress and pitch than the speech of other regions, especially the dialects of the Middle West; the so-called "Southern drawl" does not reflect a slower tempo--for Southerners normally speak more rapidly than Middle Westerners--but rather this heavier stress, combined with prolongation of the heavily stressed syllables and shortening of the weak stressed ones.

Within the pronunciation of American English, there is only one major difference in the system of phonemes: most dialects contrast unrounded /a/ and rounded /ɔ/, as *cot* and *caught*, but some do not. Where the contrast does not exist, some dialects--Eastern New England, Western Pennsylvania, the Saint Louis area--have a low-back rounded vowel, while others--the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, northern Minnesota, Western Canada--have a low-central or low-back unrounded one. Until recently, some dialects in the area of New England settlement had a falling diphthong /iu/ in such words as *blue*, *suit*, *grew*, where most speakers of American English have /u/, and in such words as *due*, *tube*, *new*, *student*, where some regions have /u/, rapidly disappearing.

Although general structural differences in the pronunciation systems of dialects are rare, conditioned structural differences are more common. As we have indicated, the consonant sequences /tj-, dj-, nj-, and stj-/--in such words as *tube*, *due*, *new*, *student*--simply do not occur in some regions, though all of these consonants are found in all American dialects. Dialects that contrast /a/ and /ɔ/, as in *cot* and *caught*, may not have the contrast before /-r/, as in *barn* and *born*; this is especially true in the Saint Louis area, in parts of the Southwest, and in the Rocky Mountains. All varieties of American English contrast /ɔ/ and /o/, as in *law* and *low*, but before /-r/, as in *horse* and *hoarse*, the contrast is retained only in parts of the South. Again, only in parts of the South and some Atlantic seaboard Yankee areas--and probably not so common there as it used to be--does one find the contrast between *met*, *mat*, and *mate* maintained before intervocalic /-r-/, in *merry*, *marry* and *Mary*; from Cleveland west these three words are generally homonyms. And in the Charleston area there seems to be only one front vowel before post-vocalic /-r/ or its derivative /ə/, so that *fear* and *fair*, *ear* and *air* are homonyms.

The phonemes may differ in phonetic shape, /e/ in *date* is an up-gliding diphthong with a high beginning [eI] in the South Midland, and up-gliding diphthong with a low beginning [eI] in the Delaware Valley and the Pittsburgh area, a monophthong [ẹ] in the Pennsylvania German area and an ingliding diphthong [ẹə] in the South Carolina Low-Country. The /ɔ/ of *law*, *dog* has a high beginning and an in-glide in much of the Middle Atlantic Seaboard, including old-fashioned New York City speech; in much of the South and South Midland, it has a low beginning with an up-glide and increasing rounding.

More familiar are differences in incidence of phonemes. Up-state New York has /a/ in *fog*, *hog* and *on*; Pennsylvania has /ɔ/. The fish *crappie* has /a/ in the stressed syllable in Michigan, /æ/ in South Carolina. The North and North Midland prevailingly have /-s-/ in *greasy* and /I/ in *creek*; the South and South Midland have /-z-/ and /i/.

Differences in inflection are less frequent than in pronunciation. Systematic differences are very rare: a few British dialects retain the old second person singular *thou*, *thy*, *thine*, *thee*; some American dialects have developed a new second person plural, *you-all*, *you-uns*, *youse*, *mongste-ye*, *oona*, though none of these has standing in formal writing and only *you-all* has achieved the dignity of standard informal status; possibly some dialects have lost the distinctiveness of the third singular present indicative *-s* and consistently have either *-s* or zero throughout the present. (10) In the shape of the morpheme there are more differences: standard *drank* as a preterit, versus *drunk* and *drinkt*; standard *climbed* versus *clim*, *clum*, *clome*, *cloom* and the like; and on the standard level, such variations as between *kneeled* and *knelt* or between *dove* /dov/ and *dived*.

It is notorious that the description of English syntax is less adequate than that of its pronunciation or inflections. But even at this point we can recognize some regional patterns. In the South and South Midland such compounded auxiliaries as *might could* and *used to could* are common in educated informal speech; the New England settlement area forms the negative of *ought* by the periphrastic *hadn't ought*; in eastern Kentucky *used to* has become a sentence-initial adverb, as in *used to, everybody around here baked their own bread*.

Regional differences in vocabulary still abound, despite the homogenizing effect of Twentieth Century urban civilization. Perhaps few of our students today would recognize the Northern *whippletree* or Midland *singletree* by any name, and urban living has probably prospered *dragon fly* and *earthworm* at the expense of such regional designations as Northern *darning needle*, South Midland-Southern *snake doctor* and Southern coastal *mosquito hawk*, or Merrimac Valley *mudworm*, Pennsylvania German *rainworm*, Southern mountain *redworm*. But a dry cleaning establishment in Boston is a *cleanser*; the New Orleans *poorboy*, a sandwich on a small loaf of bread, is a *submarine* in Boston, a *grinder* in upstate New York, a *hero* in New York city, a *hoagy* in Philadelphia; the grass strip between sidewalk and street, still unnamed in some regions, is a *boulevard* in Minneapolis, a *tree belt* in Springfield, Massachusetts, a *tree lawn* in Cleveland and a *devil strip* in Akron. And similarly differences in meanings persist. It may be only academic that in the Carolina mountains a *corn dodger* is a small loaf, in the coastal plain a *dumpling*, in Savannah a *pancake* and in Brunswick, Georgia, a *hush puppy*; but one who customarily uses *brat* to describe a noisy child may run into difficulties in parts of Indiana where it denotes a bastard; and the Middle Westerner used to ice cream in a *milk shake* will be disappointed in Boston, where it contains only milk and syrup.

If the basis of regional dialects is the fact that communities or regions differ in their history, the basis of social dialects is that people of different social standing in a given community will use different forms, and that the status of the linguistic forms will be determined by the standing of their users in the community.

Although this general principle has been recognized for generations, the procedures for discussing the correlation between speech differences and differences in status have been systematically worked out only in recent years, and are still being refined. For a long time the difference between what was good and what was bad was more a matter of the observer's prejudices than of his observations. However, with Fries's *American English Grammar* (1940) and the American Linguistic Atlas project (1933, with the first publication in 1939), it has become customary to identify the social status of informants first, by non-linguistic means, and then to describe, simply, the forms they use. A further refinement has been recently introduced by William Labov, in his dissertation *The Social Stratification of English in New York City* (Washington, 1966), by limiting himself to a smaller number of variables, by obtaining examples in a variety of contexts--ranging from the reading of potentially minimal pairs to the account of an incident in which the informant thought he was going to be killed--and informants' identifications of the social status of particular variants. Labov has revealed that in pronunciation New Yorkers have a considerable gap between their target and their actual usage; whether or not such a gap exists in other regions--I suspect it is less important in the South than in the urban Northeast--can be determined only by further investigation. But whatever the answer, Labov has already rendered the profession an invaluable service by providing a kind of instrument for answering questions that have long been felt.

Although the situation in any given community is far more complex, a working evaluation of social dialects starts with a threefold classification:

1. Uneducated, or folk speech.

2. Common speech--in the more general sense of everyday usage of the average citizen, not in the Southern pejorative sense.

3. Educated, cultivated, or standard speech.

It is from the last group that speech with national prestige has developed. In the European situation, as we have pointed out, there is often a single prestigious variety of the language--in origin, normally the upper-class speech of the capital or the surrounding area, or of some other important center. In the New World, on the other hand, there are a number of prestigious regional varieties, deriving from regional cultural traditions; one has only to think of the differences in the speech of the last five college-educated Presidents: Calvin Coolidge (western New England), Herbert Hoover (northern Middle Western, modified by travel), Franklin Roosevelt (Hudson Valley), John F. Kennedy (Boston), Lyndon Johnson (southern Texas).

When we have discovered the principal dialect levels in our society, and their regional variants, we must still observe a few cautions. First, the social distance between levels is not the same in all communities. In, say, the older plantation communities, the distance between plain, everyday people and the élite--was greater than that between folk and common. On the other hand, in such urban centers as Detroit, Cleveland and Chicago, the distance between uneducated speech and common speech is greater than that between common and cultivated. In New York City the spacing between the various levels may be fairly wide; in a small Midwestern town without heavy industry it may be narrow.

Second, who is or is not cultivated depends on local standards, and is more or less relative. It is only a slight exaggeration to cite the experience of a graduate student from Georgia who went with his Harvard classmates to a performance of Tobacco Road. In their discussion afterwards, one of the New Englanders asked if Jeeter Lester and his family were really typical of rural Georgia. "Hell, no!" exclaimed the Georgian. "Back home we'd call people like that the country club set." It is very likely that in terms of absolute education and cultural exposure a storekeeper in a college community like Ann Arbor or Chapel Hill would rank above the local doctor or superintendent of schools in a county seat in southern West Virginia.

Third, local mores differ strikingly in the tolerated differences between formal and informal educated speech. Where social differences are based on tradition and on family status, as among the "county" families of England and their analogues in the older parts of the American South, informal cultivated speech addressed to equals or other intimates may differ remarkably from the norms of formal expository prose. For Middle Western suburbs, one may agree with the melancholy observation of James H. Sledd that "any red-blooded American would prefer incest to ain't"; but in a community like Charleston one may encounter ain't a hundred times a day in conversation among the proudest families. So the educated Midwesterner often considers the informal speech of the educated Southerner as very careless; the educated Southerner, in turn, missing the familiar conversational cues to informality, often considers the conversation of educated Middle Westerners as strained and anxious. In short, each suspects the other's cultural credentials. Perhaps it is inevitable in an ostensibly open society that covert class markers become more significant as the overt ones disappear.

Regardless of the degree of difference in a locality, there seem to be two basic situations in which social dialects arise. The most familiar one is that in which different groups within the same community acquire different status, thanks to differences in education and wealth and power, so that the speech of one group is deemed worth emulating and that of other groups is not. This is the situation that has developed over the years in the small towns of much of New England, Upstate New York, and the Southern Uplands; it is probably the same kind of situation out of which the manners and speech of the gentry acquired status in rural England.

The other situation, perhaps more common in our industrialized and urbanized society, is that in which groups of original settlers differ in their social status or a large group of new immigrants may acquire a peculiar status in the community. Most of the time this peculiar status is that of social inferiority, though we can all think of the exception, the outsiders who bring social prestige with them--the English civil servant in the colonies; the Swedish pastor in Minnesota; the proper Bostonian in Rochester, New York; the Richmond family in Charleston, West Virginia. But these are atypical. The social dialect problems created by immigration are of three basic kinds:

1) The speech of those whose native language is something different from that of the community, whether Yiddish, Cajan French, Puerto Rican Spanish, or Hungarian.

2) The speech of groups who use a non-standard dialect from the same region; a classical example is the speech of the rural Southern Negroes or poor whites who come to cities like Savannah or Birmingham in search of better jobs.

3) The third situation involves the migration into one region of speakers of substandard dialects of another region. Here we have not only the problem of clearly recognizable social differences, but that of regional ethnocentrism: of the tendency to look upon what is regionally different as ipso facto inferior. Detroiters often overtly try to eradicate West Virginia vowels (or what they think are West Virginia vowels); South Carolinians often

remark--not so publicly as Detroiters, because they have a tradition of greater politeness, or at least of a wry diffidence in such matters--that to their ears educated Middle Westerners sound like uneducated Southerners, since the strong post-vocalic /-r/ in barn and beard is in the South traditionally associated with poor white speech. To this category belong the language problems of Appalachian whites and Southern Negroes in such Northern and Western cities as New York, Cleveland, Chicago and Los Angeles.

It is in this last situation that historical and regional and social differences intersect. For example, in much of Southern England the uninflected third singular present indicative, as he do, is found in old-fashioned rural speech. This feature must have been brought to all of the American colonies. However, it is unevenly distributed today, because of differences in the cultural situation. The Southern colonies were more rural than the rest, more dependent on agriculture for a longer time, and on money-crop agriculture that required a great deal of low-grade hand labor--cotton and tobacco. The average income in the South is still lower than that in other regions; Southerners travel less; they have, on the average, fewer years of schooling and that of an inferior quality to what is available in other regions. It is therefore not surprising that such forms as he do are today more widely distributed in the South and South Midland than in other dialect regions, simply because the conditions there were more favorable to their survival.

But this is not all. Within the South itself, a similar cultural differential operated to the disadvantage of the Negro--long enslaved, and discriminated against even after Emancipation. For a long time the Southern Negro population was more rural than the Southern white, more confined to agriculture and to the more menial kinds of agricultural work. The Southern Negro was less given to travel; his income was--and is--lower than that of his white neighbor; schooling is for fewer years and of poorer quality. For this reason, in the South, such forms as he do will be heard from a greater proportion of Negroes than of whites. And since, in recent years, the migrants from the South to Northern and Western urban areas are more likely to be Negroes than whites, and Negroes are more likely to be identified as recent migrants, in such areas forms like he do are likely to be considered as simply Negro speech forms, though historically they are regional forms widely disseminated in southern England, and regionally in the United States they are characteristically Southern. Though the origins of Negro dialects in the United States are undoubtedly more complicated than Nineteenth Century observers suggested--Lorenzo Turner's Africanisms in the Gullah Dialect (Chicago, 1949) has been particularly helpful in providing a new perspective--it is clear that, for the most part, Negro usages that differ from middle-class white practice are largely the result of this kind of selective cultural differentiation. (11)

Our knowledge of none of these three dimensions--historical, regional and social--is so complete that we can close our eyes to the need of adding further data. Yet even now we know enough to provide a richer understanding to all those who are concerned with dimensions of usage--whether they are interested in dictionary labeling, school programs, or simply the phenomena of cultural history and social structure. If our statements are more complicated than some of our friends would wish, the fault is not in our science but in the tangled web of human relationships.

NOTES

1. Statements about American regional dialects are drawn principally from the archives of the Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada, by permission of the American Council of Learned Societies. Many details have appeared in previous derivative studies, notably Hans Kurath, *A Word Geography of the Eastern United States* (Ann Arbor, 1949); E. Bagby Atwood, *A Survey of Verb Forms in the Eastern United States* (Ann Arbor, 1953); and Kurath and R. I. McDavid, Jr., *The Pronunciation of English in the Atlantic States* (Ann Arbor, 1961).

2. Notably in John S. Kenyon, "Cultural Levels and Functional Varieties of English," *College English* 10.31-36 (October, 1948); Martin Joos, *The Five Clocks* (Bloomington, Indiana, 1962); Harold B. Allen, *Readings in Applied English Linguistics*, 2nd ed., (New York, 1964), pp. 272-6.

3. Examples have been cited by the late J. R. Firth, from British officers in India, by Kenneth L. Pike, from a variety of situations, and from my own experiences in the American South.

4. The expectations extend to other behavior as well. The political backlash of 1966, among white middle-class and working-class voters, was intensified by the way these expectations were disregarded by the irresponsible dress and behavior of certain well-advertised liberal groups, such as the Berkeley Left and the Chicago Students Against the Rank--beards, stringy hair, sloppy clothing, noise and general boorishness. The invasion of lower middle-class Chicago suburbs by such groups did nothing to further desegregation of private housing; nor did similar invasions of the South in 1964 and 1965 further the civil liberties cause in that region. It will be noted that participants in the original sit-in movements in the South won a great deal of local respect for their essential cause by carefully observing local conventions in such non-essentials as dress and personal grooming, and thus providing a striking contrast with the local poor whites who opposed them.

5. Edward T. Hall, *The Silent Language* (New York, 1967); and *The Hidden Dimension* (New York, 1966); Ray Birdwhistell, *Kenesics* (Louisville, 1956); Henry Lee Smith, Jr., and Robert E. Pittenger, "A Basis for Some Contributions of Linguistics to Psychiatry," *Psychiatry* 20.61-78 (1957); George L. Trager, "Paralanguage: A First Approximation," *Studies in Linguistics* 13.1-12 (1958); Robert E. Pittenger, Charles F. Hockett and John J. Danehy, *The First Five Minutes* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1960); William M. Austin, "Some Social Aspects of Paralanguage," *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, 11.31-39 (1965). The last also appears in *Communication Barriers for the Culturally Deprived*, Cooperative Research Project 2107, U.S. Office of Education, 1966.

6. A phoneme is a minimal distinctive unit in the sound system; as any reader knows, there are various competing analyses of the phonemes of English. In this paper the phonemic transcriptions, in slashes, follow the analysis of Kurath and McDavid, *The Pronunciation of English in the Atlantic States*; phonetic transcriptions are in square brackets.

7. A morpheme is a minimal meaningful form; it may be derivational, as for the making of abstract nouns from adjectives, or inflectional, as for the forming of the plural.

8. For detailed discussions see, for example, Leonard Bloomfield, *Language*, (New York, 1933); Charles F. Hockett, *A Course in Modern Linguistics* (New York, 1958); Thomas Pyles, *The Growth and Development of the English Language* (New York, 1964).

9. Dialect mixture has been so common in American English from the beginning that consistent leveling in the present is probably rare.

10. *Language* 40.473, (1964).

11. Of course the same forces would also help to preserve features of ancestral languages. As Turner points out, the relative isolation--geographical and social--of the Gullah Negroes of South Carolina and Georgia has preserved many relics of West African languages, and some of these could reinforce forms derived from non-standard English dialects. The complex backgrounds of American Negro dialects require intense investigations.

THE STUDY OF DIALECTS

N. Louanna Furbee

Americans are a mobile people, socially as well as geographically. When an American moves to a distant point in the country, he usually finds that his new neighbors speak a regional dialect that is not quite the same as his own; likewise, when an American moves into a different social stratum, he often finds that the speech of his associates differs from his own. He probably, perhaps unconsciously, will try to acquire features of the speech of those around him; to do so will increase his social and economic effectiveness within his new environment. It should be obvious that the acquisition of such speech will make easier his acceptance in another stratum; indeed, it may be necessary for him to acquire the new dialect before he can be accepted. This social stratum, by the way, may be represented by several things: a job, a neighborhood, a sales contact, a promotion, a kind of vacation, all the things that represent a social class in a country such as the United States where classes are not entirely matters of inheritance but are instead based on income, accomplishment, and innumerables such as "tastes" or "prestige" that seem to defy neat definition.

A social class may be defined as any group that shares certain socio-economic characteristics; however, what may be regarded as socially significant in one community, may not be so regarded in another. Stemming from this observation is the following working definition developed by Julian Pitt-Rivers: A social class is what is recognized as a social class by the members of the community.

Recently, large numbers of lower and lower-middle class Americans from the South and from Spanish-speaking areas have migrated to distant parts of the country, usually to urban areas, often to Northern cities, in search of an economic climate that will allow them to earn more and live better. Because these people usually move into different geographical dialect areas, it may well be that the social dialect differences in their speech have become more apparent in their new geographical setting than ever they were in their original one.

In any case, such migrations have prompted great interest in the function of a social dialect as a class marker, especially when the social dialect is one that hinders the assimilation of in-migrants by their adopted communities. Language is only one of the problems faced by the in-migrant, but it is a key one. Evidence of concern for these people may be found among educators, sociologists, anthropologists, urban specialists, and linguists of all sorts, especially dialectologists.

In 1964, a conference bringing together members of all these disciplines was held in Bloomington, Indiana, under the auspices of the Illinois Institute of Technology and the National Council of Teachers of English. Publication of the report of this conference, _Social Dialects and Language Learning_, may be considered evidence of the developing interest in dialectology as a key to what can be done about acquisition of standard dialects by speakers of nonstandard dialects.

Before going further into the problems of acquisition of a standard dialect, it is necessary to define what we mean by a dialect. First, we must agree that everyone speaks a dialect; unlike its usage among many European authorities, the term among Americans is not synonymous with rustic or archaic speech. Furthermore, dialect is not purely a matter of accent, that is, variations in pronunciation, nor does it refer just to differences in vocablary or arrangement of words in an utterance. It is all these things and more. Every aspect of speech should be included in the definition of what a dialect is.

If we agree that everyone speaks a dialect and that all features of speech are included in this dialect, does this then mean that every person speaks a dialect different from that of every other person? After all, it is true that no one speaks exactly the same way as anyone else; more than that, it has been shown that no one person ever says the same thing twice in the same way. We can see that what was a useful concept might be sliced so thin as to have no further utility. In a sense, however, we can answer these questions with both a yes and a no. To do so, we conclude that a dialect viewed at the level of the speech of a single person is an idiolect--the dialect of an individual. We reserve the word dialect for referring to those features of speech that are common to a large group of speakers, to a speech community.

In order to describe a particular dialect, then, we must identify those groups of people that share enough features in their speech to qualify as a speech community. There are two ways of approaching the problem of identifying such speakers and their dialects: One way, the geographical or regional approach, has a long history and might be said to be the traditional sort of dialect investigation. The second, although much more recent, is prime among our considerations here; it involves identifying those features shared by a social group or class, and the dialect so identified is a social dialect. In the United States, as opposed to other countries such as France where educated Parisian French is taken as a standard, there is no one regional dialect of such prestige that it is considered "standard." Although we speak of Standard English (or the standard dialect) as though it were a single type of speech common to all whose dialect is acceptable, in truth we are talking about a collection of dialects, varying more or less among themselves and each of which is equally acceptable. Unquestionably, these standard dialects resemble each other, especially in matters of grammar, but they are nonetheless not homogeneous.

For the most part, differences between regional standard dialects are matters of phonology; a speaker of a Southern standard English will be identified in a Northern community by speakers of a Northern standard English as having a Southern accent, or drawl, but he will, in no important way, be discriminated against; quite to the contrary, his dialect may be looked on as charming or pleasant or different, certainly nothing more pejorative than quaint. The speaker of a Northern standard English will have a similar linguistic experience in the South, and so on. But the speaker of any nonstandard dialect, whether he comes from Jackson, Mississippi; Chicago, Illinois; Las Vegas, Nevada; Beckley, West Virginia; Seattle, Washington; Cheyenne, Wyoming, or any other place, will be discriminated against on the basis of his speech, regardless of his talents, actual or potential contributions to society, or personality. It is true that social dialects, standard and nonstandard, within a dialect region share many characteristics, especially in phonology, but the pronunciation differences require specialized instruction because there is often less awareness of these differences and new muscular skills must be taught. Although similar divergences in verb forms and other aspects of morphology and syntax are more general throughout nonstandard dialects of all regions, these seem to be more easily learned.

Generally speaking, problems in social dialectology have been examined with regional dialects as the touch-stone. These regional dialects, for their part, have been studied from the standpoint of phonological differences, grammatical differences, and vocabulary differences.

Linguistic Atlas

The methods of the *Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada* have been applied to a study of nearly every region of this country, although only the Atlas for New England has been published. These methods involve the interviewing of speakers who are representative of the dialects of each community by a trained field worker who uses a standardized questionnaire, or work sheet. Each informant (a technical term designating the person being interviewed) is asked questions designed to elicit certain responses. These responses may be diagnostic of the phonological features, grammatical features, the vocabulary, or any combination of these three, of the dialect. All responses are recorded in detailed phonetic transcription by the field worker.

Obviously, the Atlas methods create a highly structured sort of investigation. The questionnaire for the *Linguistic Atlas of New England* included about 900 items; for just the New England area, 413 informants were interviewed, which indicates the thorough sort of coverage that such a study affords.

In addition to the *Linguistic Atlas of New England* and the *Handbook* for it by Hans Kurath, three valuable books are available, which draw on the field records of the Linguistic Atlas of New England and the as yet unedited Middle and South Atlantic records covering the area extending from New York to Georgia. One of these, *Pronunciation of English in the Atlantic States* by Hans Kurath and Raven I. McDavid, Jr., is an excellent source for phonological information on the speech of these states. *A Survey of Verb Forms of the Eastern United States* by E. Bagby Atwood is a grammatical study, giving the distribution of a selected group of verb forms as shown by the Atlas records. A third, *A Word Geography of the Eastern United States*, by Hans Kurath, is concerned with geographical distribution of vocabulary items elicited by the Linguistic Atlas field workers.

From these books and, even more, from the field records of the Atlas, it is possible to determine the regional differences in the speech of Americans and, to a lesser degree, the social differences since informants were selected according to the speech-type they represented--old-fashioned, common, or cultivated. Therefore, the findings of the Linguistic Atlas provide an excellent basis on which to begin social dialect investigations; because they give regional differences, they may be used in social dialect studies as a reference for what is regional rather than social.

In recent years, the questionnaire method of the Linguistic Atlas has been applied to social dialect studies, notably by Lee Pederson, who examined the phonology of Chicago speech by interviewing both White and Negro informants with a modified version of the Shorter Work Sheets of the *Linguistic Atlas of New England*. Others have used this or similar questionnaire-based techniques to study the speech of a community in depth; for example Gerald Udell applied this method to a similar examination of the speech of Akron, Ohio. These in-depth studies of single communities afford us a close look at a densely populated area in a way that the Linguistic Atlas, because of its wide coverage, could not do.

Still derivative of Linguistic Atlas methods, such devices as check lists and non-Atlas based questionnaires have also been applied to the problem of social dialects.

Currently, a second atlas-type study is in progress: *The Dictionary of American Regional English* (DARE). Under the direction of Frederic G. Cassidy, of the University of Wisconsin, the DARE project has completed most of its field work at this time (1968). The questionnaire being used is long, about 1500 items, and is concerned chiefly with vocabulary, although many pronunciation and grammatical features are being investigated also. DARE will interview 1000 informants, who represent all of the 50 states.

A third investigation, under the direction of A. L. Davis, will be a collection of tape recordings, which will sample the pronunciation of varieties of standard English in the United States and Canada.

Other Methods

Some investigators have chosen to discard the questionnaire-based interview for a type of investigation that more closely resembles traditional anthropological linguistic field work in description of language. They have tried to describe social dialects, especially Negro dialects, as though they were analyzing a foreign language. Whereas the Atlas method is so structured that it involves a built-in comparison of the nonstandard social dialect to the standard (we might say prestige) dialect, the anthropologically influenced linguists wish to approach the nonstandard dialect as a separate entity so they may analyze its grammar as a system in itself, reserving until later the comparison to the standard dialect. Extensive use of tape recordings now makes it possible to study hours of connected speech. Syntax can be more adequately sampled, and minute phonological features can be recognized. There is of course, much merit in examining a dialect on its own terms and without imposing the grammar of another dialect on it, even for comparison, until it has been fully treated as a separate entity. It is unfortunate that such study is lengthy, for the social problems cry for immediate answers, be it anthropological or questionnaire-based.

There are a number of current research projects, many of which are outlined in the Annotated Bibliography, which hold promise for answering at least some small part of the complex problem we call social dialectology. The standard dialect of Negro college students is being studied at Tuskegee Institute of Alabama; there is a study of the language of the District of Columbia area being conducted under the auspices of the Center for Applied Linguistics. Roger Shuy has recently completed an examination of the social dialects in Detroit. There are several studies on the acquisition of language by children, especially the development of syntax in disadvantaged children. William Labov and co-workers have recently completed one part of their study on the structure of English used by Negro and Puerto Rican speakers in New York City. Other workers are designing pattern drills to help teach standard dialect forms to speakers of nonstandard dialects. Two investigators studied the other side of the problem; they tried to identify what sorts of dialects are interpreted as being nonstandard by the community. Edward T. Hall has been working on how various ethnic groups, particularly Negroes, use space in inter-personal encounters; for example, how closely they stand to one another in various sorts of conversation and to what degree eye contact is required.

As mentioned previously, the Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada is the main source of information on the regional dialects of the United States. The published part of it, that for New England, and the three books derived from a study of its field records all establish three major dialect areas, a finding made the more valid because each of the three books taking in material beyond New England concentrated on a different kind of information: one on phonology, one on grammar, and one on vocabulary. Moreover, the dialect areas all correlate nicely with settlement history for those regions.

When a linguistic geographer sets about to identify dialect areas, he examines the field records item by item for the distribution of sounds, grammatical items, and vocabulary terms. The usage of each of these by every informant is plotted on a map. If, for example, the item in question is the sibilant consonant sound used in the word greasy, he will plot the responses of all the informants to the question on the work sheet that yields this word. After these have been mapped, he will look for differences in usage. Wherever he finds differences, he will set apart areas where one sound predominates from areas where another sound predominates. In this way, he draws lines between regions that differ as to the particular sibilant used by a majority of speakers living there. The resulting dividing lines are called isoglosses, a term similar to the meteorological word isobar, but in this case it is a linguistic boundary for one sound in one word.

One isogloss, such as the [grisi] - [grizi] line, tells nothing by itself except that there is a geographical difference in the pronunciation of one word greasy. If we were to find other differences in pronunciation, grammatical items, and vocabulary items, that share the distribution of the two pronunciations of greasy, we have a bundle of isoglosses or a dialect boundary. And we have identified a regional dialect area.

It is by these methods that regional dialect areas have been identified in this country as in others. These major American dialect areas for the eastern states are Northern, the Midland, and Southern.

The North

The North includes the following sub-dialect regions: Northeastern New England, Southeastern New England, Southwestern New England, Upstate New York and Western Vermont, the Hudson Valley, and the New York City area.

Pronunciations with [-s-] in grease (verb) and greasy and [U] in roots are characteristic of the North. Pail (rather than the Midland and Southern bucket) is a Northern vocabulary item; *dove* as a preterit of *dive* is also predominantly Northern, as is *hadn't ought* for "ought not."

The Midland

The Midland encompasses two main sub-dialect areas, the North Midland and the South Midland, which in turn may be divided into the Delaware Valley (Philadelphia area), the Susquehanna Valley, the Upper Ohio Valley (Pittsburgh area), and Northern West Virginia--all North Midland. and Southern West Virginia and Western North and South Carolina--the South Midland.

Typical Midland pronunciations are /-r/ kept after vowels (also Inland Northern); [ɔ], in *on* (also Southern), in *wash* and *wasp*, and in *hog*, *frog* and *fog*; [θ] regularly in *with*, and [r] frequently intrudes in *wash* and *Washington*. *Blinds* for "window shades" is a characteristic vocabulary item. In the grammar of the Midland dialect, *I want off* is common.

The South

The South includes the following areas: Delmarva (Eastern Shore of Maryland and Virginia and Southern Delaware), the Virginia Piedmont, Northeastern North Carolina (Albermarle Sound and Neuse Valley), the Cape Fear and Peedee Valleys, and South Carolina.

Loss of [r] except before vowels is the usual pronunciation in the Southern dialect region as it is also of Eastern New England and New York City. Among the many characteristic Southern vocabulary items are *tote* for "carry." In grammar the expression *might could* for "might be able" is common.

Until very recently, it was thought that the entire United States beyond these sections fell into one great dialect area, the speech of which was called General American. As the investigations of the Linguistic Atlas and related studies have been extended westward, however, General American has been found to be a fallacy resulting from lack of research.

In the dissertation of A. L. Davis (1948), the Northern and Midland boundaries were extended through Ohio, Indiana and Illinois. Certain other western extensions of the Northern Midland and Midland-Southern boundaries have been proved, but until the final work on the Linguistic Atlas has been completed, the western boundaries must be considered tentative.

Several short works on regional American dialects are available. One of the best of these is the chapter, "American English Dialects," by Raven I. McDavid, Jr., in *The Structure of American English* by W. Nelson Francis. Roger Shuy has written a short book, *Discovering American Dialects*, published by the National Council of Teachers of English. There is a good chapter on dialect geography, including both American and European dialect studies, in *Language* by Leonard Bloomfield, the usefulness of which is restricted very little by the fact that it dates to 1933. Carroll E. Reed's *Dialects of American English* has good summaries of Eastern dialect features, as well as information about the Far West.

Although poverty has become a national concern, far too little is known about it or what it means to be disadvantaged. Evidence for this fact is found in the diverse definitions of disadvantaged and, for that matter, of poverty. If we cannot even agree on what poverty or being disadvantaged constitutes, it may seem fruitless to plan programs to help people we cannot identify. To be very arbitrary, however, we can say that if a person has difficulty finding regular employment, if his children profit little from the kind of schooling offered them, and if there is unrest or instability in the environment, then there is an obvious need for help of some kind. That many of these people also have social dialects that restrict their achievement lends credence to these criteria; furthermore, the dialect problems are among the easiest to identify and, in theory, to treat.

If however, we set out to train all disadvantaged school children to speak a standard dialect, we must be very careful that in our zeal we do not set for ourselves the goal of completely changing the speech of such children from nonstandard to standard. Fortunately, this is probably an impossible task, for were we to do such a thing we would seriously undermine the child's relationship with his family and friends. Indeed, we would be making the very mistake that English teachers have been committing for decades: telling the child that his language, that of his parents and close associates, is a bad language. That it is not. But without a doubt, his dialect is not the one that will permit him the greatest mobility in society. Rather the best goal is one that would give such children a second dialect, a standard one, which they may use on appropriate occasions, for example, at school and later on, at work.

The burden of this effort falls, unfortunately, on those who are already at the disadvantage. At this early stage in social dialect work, it would seem necessary that this be so, but the best sort of program would be one that included an educational campaign about dialects directed at the general public. If the privileged knew only one fact, that the grammars of all dialects are systematic although different, their acceptance of divergencies from their own standard speech would probably be increased greatly.

So in our work, we are made to serve two masters: one of expediency and one of idealism. By educating the public now, however, we may be bringing the two closer.

There are several aids to the study of social dialects; one of these, the work sheet, is used in direct interview with each informant; usually all or many of the informant's responses must be written in phonetic transcription and then tape-recorded. For example, one item is included on most questionnaires to determine if the informant uses a voiced or voiceless th sound (/ð/ or /θ/) in the word with before an m sound. The frame specified for this is one that will elicit the response, "with milk," from the informant. Such questioning might go something like this:

Field Worker: If you put something in your coffee in addition to sugar, you might say that you drink your coffee...

Informant: With cream.

Field Worker: Yes, but suppose you didn't have any cream, you might use something similar as a substitute and then you'd say that you drank that cup of coffee...

Informant: With milk.

Field work takes skill and can be tedious. It is really the only way to get valid phonological and informal grammatical data, however. A worksheet questionnaire allows us to gather comparable data for speakers most economically. The questions asked to assure the required responses vary somewhat between field workers. What is most essential is that the field worker understand what information is being sought.

Another kind of questionnaire is called a check list. It does not require interviewing by a field worker, and an investigation by check list may be conducted by mail. A series of multiple choice questions are designed to yield responses that are diagnostic of dialect differences. Because the check list is filled out by the informant, the most successful questions are those involving vocabulary items, choosing from different words for the same thing. To seek phonological data requires tampering with conventional orthography, and often an informant will choose a standard grammatical form on the check list even if he regularly uses a nonstandard form in his speech.

Check lists are valuable accompaniments to field studies with work sheets since many more people can be reached than is possible with the field worker and interview technique. When the questions on a check list are chosen very carefully and the analysis is made with equal care, new territory can be covered by them.

In 1966, the dissertation of William Labov was published by the Center for Applied Linguistics. In it were two different kinds of important information: The first is reflected in the title, *The Stratification of English in New York City*; included was a probing investigation of the speech of New York City, information long needed. Of almost equal importance, however, was the sort of methods used by Labov to collect this information. He was able to use a detailed sociological study of the Lower East Side and identified five variables in speech that seemed to distinguish various social classes. These five variables (use of *r* in post-vocalic and preconsonantal position; the vowel in *bad*, *ask*, *dance*, *had*, and *cash*; the stressed vowel in *awful*, *coffee*, *office*; the use of [θ] in *thin*; and the use of [ð] in *then* and *the*) he investigated in a great variety of situations and styles of speech. He also interviewed a selected sample of informants with a longer questionnaire. He found he was able to do something that no previous investigator had been able to do: to predict certain changes in the speech of certain groups. His study is probably the most sociological of any to date; at the same time, it is truly linguistic.

All these methods are good. In choosing a certain technique, one must weight the resources with which he has to work and the information he seeks. It is hoped that soon there will be many more people conducting research in dialectology.

Generally speaking, those who need special dialect training will come from two main groups: Southern in-migrants to Northern cities and migrants from areas or countries where a foreign language is spoken. Of the first group, by far the largest number are Southern Negroes; another important contingent are the Southern Appalachian whites. The second major group is composed, in large part, of speakers of Spanish from any of several Spanish dialect areas, Puerto Rico, Cuba, Mexico, certain parts of the Southwestern United States, and Central and South America. In addition, any sizable group who speak a language other than English in their community may be involved: within the United States are many whose first language is one of the American Indian languages, Japanese or Chinese, or a European language, such as the French of parts of Louisiana and New England. Every major city has neighborhoods where some language other than English is the first language. It may be German, Czech, Hungarian, among others. Parts of the rural Northern Middle West have large populations of speakers of a Scandinavian language. Many of these people are not poor, but their social mobility may be hindered by their language problems.

One group must be distinguished from those who need help for social dialect difficulties; these are the people, usually school children, who have physiologically based speech problems. Too often a child with a different social dialect is either sent to a speech therapist for treatment of a physiological problem he does not have, or he is regarded as mentally retarded. Children who have physiological speech problems or who are mentally retarded need help too, but it is of an entirely different nature from that needed by the child with a social dialect problem.

Because so little has been published on the acquisition of standard dialects of English, English teachers, if they are to be successful, must really become their own investigators. There are two phases in the planning of such a program for school children, the first of which is a research phase in which the nonstandard dialect must be described. The second phase is the preparation of materials for teaching the children.

Descriptive Phase

A good beginning for the descriptive phase is to make an inventory of the vowel and consonant phonemes of the nonstandard dialect being studied for contrast with the same sort of inventory for the standard dialect of the region. *Pronunciation of English in the Atlantic States* is a good source of information on regional standard dialects of many parts of the country.

After the vowel and consonant phonemes of the standard and nonstandard dialects have been compared, we can note the sounds for which exact correspondences are not evident in the two dialects. This is most easily done by using the standard dialects of the region as a reference, and listing as substitutions the sounds used in the nonstandard dialects for the sounds used in the standard. Of particular importance are consonant clusters which need to be listed completely.

At the same time that the vowels and consonants are being compared, some attention should be given to the intonation patterns. Whenever they too differ from the intonation of the standard dialect, a note should be made about it. Differences in intonation will be especially important when studying the speech of children whose first language is not English, for example, Spanish-speaking children. Gross changes in grammar may also be listed, especially variant verb forms. A Survey of Verb Forms in the Eastern United States is a good source for information on these too.

Very often "slang" or special vocabulary will receive great emphasis. While there is no doubt that these vocabulary items are interesting and often will mystify the outsider--which is, after all, their purpose--the fact that they are vocabulary and seldom form a phonological or grammatical sub-system should not be lost sight of.

Traditional teaching of English has often failed in its efforts to change nonstandard speech to standard because, although corrections were regularly made by the teacher, there was never enough drill to make the corrections stick. This situation is analogous to that in foreign language teaching in this country until the development of the aural-oral method during the Second World War.

The aural-oral method of teaching language involves the presentation of an oral model by the teacher and its imitation by the students. The key to the method is pattern drill. Each drill is designed to teach a particular phonological or grammatical pattern, but, in order to make the pattern become unconscious habit, the student's attention is drawn to substitutions in the pattern. In this way, the student absorbs the pattern in the lesson by unconscious repetition of it. For example, if the pattern being taught were the negative construction with isn't, a sample drill might be:

He isn't in school today.
He isn't in class today.
She isn't in school today.
She isn't in class today.

And so on, each time the model is given by the teacher, and the students repeat it. Sometimes, individual students may be called on to repeat the model alone. Such drills can be handled with humor and snap, but the content is without a doubt not very stimulating otherwise. The important thing is, however, that when the drill is finished, the student knows the isn't pattern for making a negative statement; he knows it in a way that reading about it in a book or writing out a sentence with it will never teach him.

These drills must always be presented orally. They lend themselves nicely to tape recording, which spares the teacher many practice hours. In that case, the model is recorded on the tape, with a pause after it for the student to repeat the model.

Following are illustrations of such a drill made up for a sound and for a grammatical feature of the standard dialect of Northern Midwestern English that differ from the corresponding sound and grammatical item of the nonstandard Appalachian dialect. It is important that the teacher present the sound, with practice on it alone, to the children before the drill. Otherwise the children may not hear the difference between the teacher's pronunciation and their substitution. In the vowel comparison for Appalachian speech and the standard dialect, the vowel sound in the word I'll has an ingliding to [ə] rather than an upgliding toward [I] or [i] after the main vowel [a]. This same sound in the words life, my, and like is also inglided. Taking as the standard pronunciation [aI], we first present it in isolation to the students, asking them to repeat it after us and encouraging them to follow the [a] sound with a high front [i] sound; a teacher can say, "Like the letter E." or "Like the sound in bee," to help with this, even though this is an exaggeration. After they have made something close to the sound in isolation, the drill may be begun.

Teacher: I'll tell you a joke.

Students: I'll tell you a joke.

(repeat as many times as needed)

Teacher: I'll tell you a story.

Students: I'll tell you a story.

Teacher: I'll tell you my joke.

Students: I'll tell you my joke.

Teacher: Do you like jokes?

Students: Do you like jokes?

Teacher: I like stories.

Students: I like stories.

Teacher: My brother plays jokes on me.

Students: My brother plays jokes on me.

Teacher: My brother likes jokes.

Students: My brother likes jokes.

Teacher: My brother likes tennis.

Students: My brother likes tennis.

From here on, the teacher can substitute any sort of item she likes. The drill should not last longer than 10 minutes without some sort of diversion if the children are grade school age. The teacher might then change to this form of question and answer drill.

Teacher: I like school. What do you like, John?

John: I like (bubble gum, candy, whatever he wishes to add). What do you like, Sue?

Sue: I like my dog, Dusty. What do you like, Mary?

Mary: I like vacation. What do you like, Billie?

And so on through the class until everyone has had a chance to tell what he likes. Throughout the practice, the teacher should make corrections of the group and of individuals. By the time the drills are over, the children should begin to have the [ai] sound as an alternate for their [a] and [aə] sounds.

The same sort of drill can be made up for grammatical items. For example, the verb form *wunt* ([wvnt]) occurs in the speech of the Appalachian children for *wasn't*. A pattern drill for this problem might be:

Teacher: He wasn't named John.

Students: He wasn't named John.

Teacher: No he wasn't.

Students: No he wasn't.

Teacher: He wasn't tall.

Students: He wasn't tall.

Teacher: No he wasn't.

Students: No he wasn't.

Teacher: He wasn't short.

Students: He wasn't short.

Teacher: No he wasn't.

Students: No he wasn't.

Teacher: He wasn't silly.

Students: He wasn't silly.

Teacher: No he wasn't.

Students: No he wasn't.

With the "He wasn't..." frame, the teacher can add in all sorts of adjectives and nouns, preferably funny ones, in the final slot. She can also ask the children to do the same, something like, "He wasn't licorice," or "He wasn't a cartwheel." The last slot merely diverts the students' attention from the "wasn't" so that the pattern will become habit. Since it is a device, it can be played with. The second pattern, "No he wasn't," gives practice with "wasn't" in a stressed position; the first, "He wasn't..." has "wasn't" in unstressed position.

As we see, the pattern drills are not difficult to make up, although creating interesting ones does take talent. After the contrastive analysis of the nonstandard dialect and the regional standard have been completed, the teacher simply takes those items that do not match. especially the phonological items, and one by one presents them in the form of a pattern drill. Always, the drill must have the lesson of the day as a constant; the alternations in it are for diverting the attention of the student.

There are many books of pattern drills designed for teaching English to speakers of foreign languages. Some of these drills might be used by the teacher; others will lend themselves to modification. Also available are contrastive analyses of English and many foreign languages. There are teaching materials published for teaching English to speakers of Spanish and many other languages; some of these materials are designed for use with children. Such books are outlined in the Annotated Bibliography.

It is well known that children learn foreign languages rapidly. There is every reason to think that they will become bidialectal with relative ease also, although it may be that it is more difficult to learn a second dialect than it is to learn a second language since the close resemblances of the two dialects may cause interference. The points of contrast between dialects are few and do not involve many changes in meaning. In some ways it is harder to learn variations to a system you already know than it is to learn an entirely new system.

SUGGESTIONS FOR TEACHING AMERICAN DIALECTS

A. L. Davis

The length of class time to devote to dialect study must necessarily be balanced with all other pressures and demands, and will vary with the needs and backgrounds of the students as well.

Suggestions are given here as to what might be done in one-, two-, three-, or four-week periods. It may happen that some courses can be organized for even longer dialect study. No college teacher would have difficulty in using such extended time profitably.

Motivation for dialect study is rarely a problem. It has as great appeal for the sophisticate as it does for the layman.

This remarkable interest is illustrated by Dr. Henry Lee Smith, Jr.'s highly successful radio show of the 1940's, called "Where Are You From?" He used local and regional dialect pronunciations to discover where volunteers selected from the studio audience had lived in the United States. The technique for this is simple. The questioner merely needs to know the distributions well and have a keen ear.

Pronunciation variants can be supplemented with grammatical and vocabulary variants; however, many speakers have almost no regional grammatical items and regional vocabulary may also be missing.

A person who rhymes greasy with easy will in most cases have lived in the southern (not Southern, necessarily) half of the United States. An educated person who uses dove as the past tense of dive will most likely have lived in the northern half. And a speaker who uses chesterfield for sofa is likely to be from the San Francisco Bay area, north of it, or from Canada.

Students, then, can be readily involved in discovering the dialect differences of friends, relatives and classmates. They may even be able to do valuable, though simple, dialect research provided they use controlled materials and choose their informants with care.

The abbreviated check-list included in this report is adequate for studying a limited segment of folk vocabulary and can be used by any student to investigate a small community.

Actual phonetic field transcription requires so much advanced training that students can seldom do reasonably accurate work. They are not trained to hear many of the important phonetic features and they are severely bound by their own phonemic patterns. Using any machine of good fidelity, the drugstore bargain machine being of such poor quality that it is next to worthless for this purpose, students can gather reliable data, however. The following items taken from the tape atlas *Recordings of Standard English: United States and Canada* will furnish plenty of pronunciation material for term papers:

The numbers 1 through 14, 20, 27, 30, 40, 70, the ordinals to ten, January, February, April, the days of the week, pool, pull, book, buck, boat, butt, gauze, goes, cot, caught, cab, cob, path, math, bat, bet, dead, did, pen, pin, beat, bit, children, scissors, dinner, Tom, Tommy, balm, palm, bomb, collar, caller, pork, fork, fire, far, heart, hard, hired, hide, hod, height, whale, white, curl, coil, bald, boiled, dog, log, fog, Mary, merry, marry, syrup, stirrup, mourning, morning, broom, room, horse, hoarse, a can, I can, card, cord, barred, boy, buoy, furry, hurry, worry, poor, pour, pore, scorch, porch, mirror, dearer, beer, dear, scare, bare, sorry, starry, story, wore, war, any, many, penny, farmer, former, whipping, whooping.

Students who have had some phonetic training and wish to do one or more short worksheet interviews should also record them on tape at the same time, so that they can re-check their transcriptions and receive criticism from their instructor.

Although data gathering is good experience in itself, this is not enough. The student should make as complete a description as he can, perhaps concentrating upon a problem using a limited portion of the data such as the vowels or consonant clusters and comparing his results with published studies.

In a community where social dialect differences are to be investigated, pronunciation, morphological and syntactic features may all prove relevant. In relatively homogeneous smaller towns, particularly in the Middle West and West, pronunciation differences are of little importance, being reflected in a slightly higher incidence of old-fashioned pronunciations and in words of low frequency. The forms of verbs and pronouns will in most cases be of greatest value. The investigator must be cautious with these grammatical items because direct questioning will often elicit only what the informant considers "correct." Relaxed conversation with directed contexts to bring out desired forms naturally can be most fruitful. As an example one might want the past tense of drown. The field worker might say "The river is pretty fast here. Have any accidents?" The informant might then come back with: "Six people got drownded last year, etc." In Linguistic Atlas field work many of the grammatical forms are taken down from conversation; the field worker knows the items so well that he picks them out on the fly, so to speak.

Syntax should be investigated with the tape recorder. In fact, the conditions of field work require this since it is humanly impossible to transcribe fast enough. Of course, a shorthand transcription could be used. The informant is encouraged to talk about anything that interests him; a garrulous one may be hard to stop.

Analysis of foreignized English is a good assignment for students who have ready access to qualified speakers. Brief contrastive studies of such speech can do much to illuminate the entire subject for the students. Often a three-way contrastive study will be needed because many of these speakers have intimate contact only with a nonstandard dialect.

It is important that the student not undertake too ambitious a project. A complete study of a single feature of pronunciation, of morphology or syntax based upon sufficient data, is far more rewarding than is a total study not supported by research.

Students should be given the opportunity of sharing their research with other class members if this is in any way possible. There should, therefore, be a variety in assignments exploring the many aspects of the subject.

The student should acquire out of this work a new orientation towards the nature of correctness in English. The teacher should realize that dialect study is an essential tool comparable in importance to the study of the history of the language. In spite of the research being done, we do not yet have descriptions of all features of standard and nonstandard English, nor is complete description likely in the foreseeable future. For this reason the classroom teacher will need to be able to make contrastive analyses, evaluating nonstandard dialects as systems not as mere deviations from a book standard.

One Week

Lecture based upon the materials of the preceding articles. Students fill in the abbreviated checklist to compare their usage.

Readings:
Selections from *Social Dialects and Language Learning*, Shuy's *Discovering American Dialects*, Reed's *Dialects of American English*, *On the Dialects of Children*; Raven I. McDavid's chapter, "The Dialects of American English" in W. Nelson Francis' *The Structure of American English*

Two Weeks

Use taped materials in class, especially speech samples. Students without previous phonetic training listen to an Atlas interview tape and study the transcriptions. Students make lists of contrasts in their own speech using series like *peat*, *pit*, *pate*, *pet*, *pat*, *pot* etc., and compare them with others in the class. Students make lists of consonant clusters in their own speech.

Readings:
Additional assignments in the above works and assignments from PEAS, WG, VF (1)

Three Weeks

Students make reports on data they have gathered.

Readings continued and expanded; additional readings may be assigned with selections from the Annotated Bibliography.

The importance of the distinction between phonetics and phonemics is emphasized.

Four Weeks

If this much time is available, phonetic transcription may be used from the start with practice drills and even some phonetic modification, i.e., narrow transcription, as illustrated by the Atlas vowels and consonant section.

Students try more ambitious projects including the making of field recordings and analysis, and the preparation of a substantial paper.

Readings:
Additional exploration of the materials from the Bibliography. The instructor may wish to make the Bibliography available to all students because it gives a good synopsis of much of the work of the field.

NOTES

1. These are the usual abbreviations for Kurath and McDavid *The Pronunciation of English in the Atlantic States*, Kurath *A Word Geography of the Eastern United States*, and Atwood *A Survey of Verb Forms in the Eastern United States*.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY William Card & V. McDavid
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

PROBLEM AREAS IN GRAMMAR

William Card
Virginia Glenn McDavid

Nouns

One major difference between standard English dialects and some nonstandard ones is in the presence or absence of a plural ending on nouns resulting in such nonstandard sentences as "The good teacher are interested in their pupils," "Their friend are not helping them," and "There are many thing that I like." It should be noted that many speakers who lack this ending omit it only when a preceding word indicates that the noun is plural and the ending is redundant, so to speak. Such speakers may say "many thing" and "five dollar," but "Good teachers are interested in their pupils." Other speakers may omit the ending in both environments. The general loss of the ending seems more common in some areas than in others; it is a major problem in Chicago inner-city schools, for example.

The teacher who chooses to develop materials for dealing with this problem should keep in mind the three pronunciations of the plural in English (not that students need such analysis) and also the fact that voiced sounds are somewhat easier to hear than voiceless at the end of words. A teaching progression in the order of the /z/ ending (*days*, *birds*, etc.), then the /s/ ending (*cats*, *marks*, etc.) and finally the /Iz/ ending (*wishes*, *judges*, etc.) is likely to work better than the reverse. Since students who have trouble with this ending are also likely to simplify final consonant clusters, so that *field* is pronounced /fil/ and *desk* /dɛs/, some care should be taken not to introduce complex clusters too early. Indeed, for many nonstandard speakers, -*sps*, *sts*, and *sks* all become -*s*, producing problems in the formation of plurals, possessives, and the third person singular of verbs.

The nature of the initial sound of the word following the plural ending should also be considered. Again, vowels and voiced consonants make the plural ending stand out more clearly, so that the /z/ on *girls* in a phrase like "the girls and their mother" is likely to be heard more clearly than the one in a phrase like "The girls tricked their mother." These same suggestions for the development of teaching materials apply also to the third person singular ending ("he walks") and to the possessive ending ("John's cap") because all three endings have the same phonological variations: /Iz/ after the six homorganic sounds of /s/, /z/, /č/, /ǰ/, /s/, and /ž/, /š/ after other voiceless sounds, and /z/ after other voiced ones.

Of all problems occurring with nouns, this omission of the plural inflection is most important. Worth noting is a use of an apparent singular in a phrase like "six foot tall" or "ten mile away." Constructions like these involve the plurals of certain nouns of measure--words like *pound*, *mile*, *acre*, *foot*--and may appear in the speech if not the writing of those whose noun forms are otherwise standard. That is, a person who says "ten dollar," "some good boy" will probably say "six foot tall," but the converse is not true, as many sports announcers evidence. The apparent singular in a phrase like "six foot tall" is historically not a singular at all, rather the relic of an Old English genitive plural form, the same that appears in phrases like a "six foot fence" and "a ten mile hike," where standard and nonstandard English alike have kept the historical forms *foot* and *mile* before nouns though not as the head of a construction or before adjectives or adverbs. The teacher who wants to work with such constructions--and it is questionable whether this time is worth spending--should concentrate on such common words as *foot* and *mile*, and develop contrasting pairs in which these words in standard English are the head of a construction or modify a following adjective or adverb or modify a following noun. Thus we find such pairs as

"five pounds"	but	"a five pound sack of sugar"
"six feet tall"	but	"a six foot fence"
"ten miles away"	but	"these ten mile hikes"

Some irregular nouns whose plurals are formed by a change in the base vowel may also cause trouble. Most common among these are such pairs as *foot-feet*, *man-men*, and *tooth-teeth*, and such analogical 'double' plurals as *feets* or *mens* are not unheard. Since the pattern by which the standard form of these plurals is formed is now a dead one, the forms can be taught only with the few words involved, in such pairs as "Tom jumped one foot but Bill jumped three feet," "Tom has only lost one tooth, but Bill has lost three teeth."

Nouns with zero plurals--*sheep*, *deer*--are rare in modern spoken English outside of a number of terms for game, fish, and animals. Should it be felt desirable, such analogical plurals as *sheeps* can be handled in similar contrastive drills.

Besides the plural, the other regular inflectional ending for English nouns is the possessive, as in "the boy's cap," "Mary's book," etc. The method of formation is the same as that for noun plurals and the third person singular of verbs: /Iz/ after the homorganic sounds /s/, /z/, /š/, /ž/, /č/, and /ǰ/, /s/ after other voiceless sounds, and /z/ after other voiced ones. Speakers who omit the ending on one of these noun forms generally omit it on the other. The plural inflection is much the commoner in spoken English, and the teacher would be wise to concentrate here. The absolute form of noun possessives never appears to lack the ending. That is, a person who would say "That John book" would not say, "That book is John." (Not all speakers have such absolute constructions for noun possessives.) Thus, a teacher who wants to work on the use of noun possessives could consider contrastive pairs like "That book is John's" and "That is John's book." Again, attention should be given to the sounds with which the noun to be inflected ends and to the nature of the following noun. Such practice might well be combined with similar practice with personal pronouns: "That book is mine;" "That is my book;" "Those books are yours;" "Those are your books;" "These books are his;" "These are his books;" etc.

Pronouns

Some further differences between standard English dialects and various nonstandard ones occur in the forms of pronouns. Among these differences are varying forms of the personal pronouns, represented below in a table with the conventional names:

	Subjective	Objective	Possessive	Intensive -	Reflexive
1st person sg.	I	me	my	mine	myself
2d person sg. + pl.	you	you	your	yours	yourself, yourselves
3d person masc, sg.	he	him	his	his	himself
3d person fem. sg.	she	her	her	hers	herself
3d person neuter sg.	it	it	its	its	itself
1st person pl.	we	us	our	ours	ourselves
3d person pl.	they	them	their	theirs	themselves

Considerable variety and inconsistency will be noted in this table, the result of historical development over the past fifteen hundred years. Except for the second person--*you* and related forms--all these persons distinguish singular and plural. The third person singular alone distinguishes gender--masculine, feminine, and neuter. The forms *you* and *it* are found in subjective and objective positions alike; they are unchanged in sentences like "You like Jim," "Jim likes you," "It hurt Jim," and "Jim broke it." In the set *her* is unique in being unchanged in objective and possessive. The absolute possessive forms, those found in sentences like "It is mine," "It is yours," etc. have a variety of patterns. *Mine* retains the /n/ it had in Old English. *His* and *its* are the same as the regular possessive, and *yours*, *hers*, *ours*, and *theirs* add an /s/ (pronounced /z/ because of the nature of the preceding sound) by analogy with the method of forming the possessive of nouns. The intensive-reflexive forms are also inconsistent. All these varying forms seem arbitrary, and the words are among the most commonly used in English. It is not surprising that problems arise with their use.

One common problem with these words occurs when a pronoun with a distinctive subject form--*I*, *he*, *she*, *we*, and *they*--is joined by a conjunction either to another pronoun or to a noun and the compound phrase is used as subject of a sentence. Here speakers of nonstandard English often substitute the objective form, giving sentences like "Jim and me work together," and "Him and me are going out." This substitution is the source of so much censure that teachers should give it some attention.

Curiously, the reverse substitution, the use of the distinctive subjective forms in objective position as direct objects or objects of prepositions, is rarely noted. A sentence like "It is very pleasant for my husband and I to visit our relatives" is far less likely to attract attention than "Him and me have been working together;" nor is the same person likely to utter both. The former is characterized by some attempts at elegance. The feeling that the subjective form is "inherently" superior is responsible for some of these occurrences. Such a feeling is probably the partial result of decades of drilling to say "It is I" rather than the natural colloquial "It's me;" but examples of this use of subjective forms in objective positions is too old for school drills to be entirely responsible. The teacher who notices a sentence like "It is pleasant for my friend and I to be with you" can probably find more profitable areas of improvement in his students' language.

"Between you and I" is a somewhat special example of the preceding problem. So much attention has been given to this one phrase that a teacher may want to consider teaching the correct "between you and me," perhaps as a fixed form like *antidisestablishmentarianism*.

The use of the objective forms--*me*, *him*, *her*, *us*, and *them*--after forms of *be* as in sentences like "It's me" and "That's him" is a matter where the teacher will have to establish some priorities, and the chances are great that other matters are more pressing. "It's me" has been standard informal English for a long time, and "It's us" is on its way to joining it. "It's they" is so stilted that many English teachers would not feel comfortable with it and would instead relax with "It's them." Historically, of course, such expressions as "It's me," "It's him," "It's them" result simply from the pressure of word order: the objective forms are the ones most commonly found after the verb.

A somewhat special case should be made for the use of *he* and *she* when answering the telephone in phrases like "This is he speaking" or "This is she." In this circumstance the subjective forms remain the preferred one. The use of these forms may well be taught apart from "grammar" and in the context of "manners."

The possessive forms *your* and *their* furnish a special set of problems: for some students who do not pronounce postvocalic /r/ in a word like *car*, these words may appear in writing as *you* and *they*. This may be a question of pronunciation of all postvocalic /r/ sounds. For other students who write *you* and *they* for *your* and *their*, a grammatical change analogical to the loss of the possessive suffix on nouns ("Mr. Brown hat") may be involved. At any rate, whether due to phonological or grammatical change, the oral loss of postvocalic /r/ in unstressed positions is probably well ignored for more fruitful topics. As was mentioned earlier, the loss of the inflectional *s*, pronounced /s/, /z/, and /Iz/ depending on the preceding sound, is a different matter, since the loss of this suffix does not fit in with phonological or grammatical changes in standard English.

Another set of problems arises with the absolute forms of the possessive pronouns: mine, yours, his, hers, its, ours, and theirs. Owing to their different methods of formation between mine and the others, analogy has operated to give two types of forms. The older operation of analogy resulted in /n/ being added to your, his, her, our, and their. All these forms are still heard and seen today, with hisn and theirn the more common. More recently in some nonstandard dialects, mine has been subjected to the workings of analogy and s, pronounced /z/, added to it so that it is consistent with the pattern of the others.

The reflexive-intensive forms--myself, yourself, yourselves, himself, herself, itself, ourselves, and themselves--provide yet another set of problems, the result of their being formed in different ways. Myself, yourself, herself, itself, yourselves, and ourselves are formed by adding the suffix to the objective form, and by analogy with the competing pattern hisself and theirselves appear.

The interrogative pronouns who and whom furnish examples of problems which probably need not concern a teacher whose students' language has matters of more pressing social importance. One of these is the alternation of who and whom in questions, the standard use of which parallels the alternation between subjective and objective forms of the personal pronouns. In some varieties of rather formal spoken standard English, who is used for the subjective form in sentences like "Who is it?" and whom for the objective form in sentences like "Whom did you see?" The pressure of word order, of course, is such that who has replaced whom in the second sentence in the informal speech of otherwise impeccable speakers. Just as me in a sentence like "It's me" comes from the feeling that the objective form is somehow right at the end of a sentence, so who in a sentence like "Who did you see" comes from a feeling that the subjective form is right for the first word in a sentence. Before campaigning on the "proper" use of whom in oral questions--and written questions with these words are rare--a teacher should be very sure that this is energy well spent.

When who and whom are used as relative pronouns, as in phrases like "the man who lives next door" and "a man whom I know," the practice in edited writing conforms invariably to the use of who in subjective functions and whom in objective ones. But again, most teachers of students from disadvantaged backgrounds will find more significant problems.

Today which as a relative pronoun is used with non-personal antecedents rather than with personal ones. All editors would alter "my aunts, which live in Saint Louis" to "my aunts, who live in Saint Louis." This use of which with a personal antecedent is common among speakers of the various varieties of nonstandard English, and its historical background is without question: many of us still say "Our Father, Which art in Heaven." Few texts or manuals of usage note this construction, and the teacher who notes it may find it more useful to consider it a clue that other problems may exist than to attack it directly.

The demonstrative pronouns--this, that, these, those--also have nonstandard variations which the teacher should consider. One of these is the replacement of those by them yielding them boys, them pencils, etc. A second development to which a teacher should give attention is the use of such compound demonstratives as this here, these here, that there, those there, and them there. All these latter forms are also ones for which various teaching devices should be developed with a view to supplementing them with the standard forms. (For example, contrast "this here girl" with "this girl here," which is standard spoken English.)

Verbs

No part of speech furnishes more usage problems than the verb, both because of the number of irregular verbs (including such "structural" verbs as the forms of be, have, and do) and because of the complexity of the structures into which verbs enter. The nature of these problems will become clearer if we look first at questions which affect most if not all verbs, then at some problems with auxiliaries, and finally at irregular verbs.

Perhaps the most important problem with verbs is the omission of the third-person present -s ending, which results in such constructions as "he like" and "it seem." This ending is phonetically identical in its forms with those of noun plurals and noun possessives: it is sounded as /Iz/ after the six homorganic sounds /s/, /z/, /š/, /ž/, and /č/, and /ǰ/, as /s/ after other voiceless sounds, and /z/ after other voiced ones. Sometimes but not always this ending is in free variation with zero in the third person present singular and in other present forms as well, giving not only "he like" but "I likes" and "they seems."

Phonetic factors complicate the articulation of this inflectional ending: after -*sp*, -*st*, and -*sk* the pronunciation of a final -*s* is not easy, and many speakers of English assimilate such clusters to -*s* or simply use -*sp*, *st*, and -*sk* to end noun plurals, noun possessives, and the third person singular present. A further complicating factor is the use of the uninflected form in questions ("Does he like"), in negatives ("He doesn't like") and in negative questions ("Doesn't he like"). While in all these a third person singular present marker is present in the auxiliary, it is missing in the verb that has the main lexical meaning in the clause. Further, in all varieties of English, questions may be asked in informal speech without the auxiliary if the intonation is appropriate: "You going up to the reunion this weekend?" "She a friend of yours?"

In English both positive and negative questions will be asked with an unmarked main verb, as in "Jim steps out a bit. Does Mary *know* it?" and "Jim steps out a bit? Doesn't Mary *know* it?" will both elicit the response "Yes," followed by "she does," "she knows," or "she does know." And the fact that both types of questions are so often heard with omission of the initial auxiliary may contribute to the omission in such present tense declaration patterns as "he like," "she do."

The establishment of standard patterns for this verb form should take into account the phonetic problems already mentioned; some consonant clusters are more difficult to hear and to articulate than others, and some are more clearly heard and articulated when the following sound is a vowel or voiced consonant. A verb whose stem ends with a vowel (pay, lie, toe, etc.) will be a better word to begin with than the word *possess*, for example.

Drills or questions constructed on the pattern of the following may furnish some suggestions for teachers:

Q: "Why does he ride his bike to school?"
A: "He rides his bike to school because he likes to."

Q: "How does Tom hit a two-bagger?"
A: "He hits them by aiming between the shortstop and the third-baseman."

Q: "Where does Tom ride his bike?"
A: "He rides it out in front of his apartment."

Q: "I work every day except Sunday. What does Jim do?"
A: "Jim works every day except Sunday too."

Drill on the forms of *do* may be worked into similar patterns:

Q: "Does he ride his bike to school?"
A: "Yes, he does."

Q: "Do they live near here?"
A: "Yes, they do."

Drill on the forms of *say*, for which the pronunciation of *says* and *said* (pronounced not /sɛz, sɛd/ but /sez, sed/) are also a problem, may similarly be worked in.

The pronunciation of the preterit and past participle of regular verbs is often a problem for the same students who have difficulty with the other inflectional endings. For them, "He promised" appears as "He promise." The phonetic principle underlying the formation of this form is the same as that for the noun plural and possessive and the verb third person singular present: the homorganic sounds, here /t/ and /d/, have the extra syllable, /Id/, added; other voiceless sounds take a voiceless ending, in this case /t/; other voiced sounds including vowels take the voiced one /d/. And as with the preceding inflectional endings, such consonant clusters as -*sp* and -*sk* in works like *clasped* and *basked* are particularly difficult.

Pattern drills of such types as the following may be useful:

Q: Tom walked out of the room. What did John do?
A: John walked out of the room too.

Q: When did Tom walk out of the room?
A: He walked out of the room a few minutes ago.

Q: How did Tom like his trip?
A: He liked his trip fine.

Q: Where did Tom work last summer?
A: He worked in the bookstore.

Drills or exercises of these same types may be used for irregular verbs, where one is trying to teach not a regular phonetic pattern but limited though common patterns. Thus for irregular verbs one may develop such drills as:

Q: Where did John teach last year?
A: He taught in the city.

Q: Where did John go last summer?
A: He went to his uncle's farm.

Q: When did John come to the city?
A: He came to the city last May.

Of the irregular verbs, none cause more problems than *be* in its various uses both as auxiliary and main verb. As a main verb *be* itself replaces *am*, *is*, and *are* in many constructions and sometimes has a final -*s* added, not only in the third person singular present slot but in the others, thus giving such forms as "He be my best friend," "They bees here," and "She be in the kitchen." These uses of *be* are not a transfer of subjunctive forms, such as occur in "If I require that he be present," but rather the continuance and extension of old indicative forms.

Here teachers may consider working with such frames as:

Q: Is John here?
A: Yes, he is.

Q: Are your friends here?
A: Yes, they are.

Q: Am I supposed to work today?
A: Yes, you are.

Along with the consideration of the forms of *be* as negative and negative question ("He isn't;" "Aren't they?") should be linked consideration of forms of *have* and *do* as auxiliaries in these constructions, because in some dialects forms of all three are placed by *ain't*. The result is that "I'm not tired," "I haven't eaten," and "I didn't eat" became "I ain't tired," "I ain't eaten," and "I ain't eat." Similarly, "Isn't he?" and "Hasn't he?" will both become "Ain't he?" Cautioning against the use of *ain't* has obviously done no good, though in some parts of the country the use of *ain't* is a real and negative social marker. Anyone who wants to establish alternative patterns should first determine the constructions in which *ain't* is used. As a substitute for forms of *be* and *have* it is more common than as a negative and negative question form for *do*.

In developing drills for this kind of material, the teacher might first use the question and answer frames of the type just mentioned but with answers calling for negative forms:

Q: Is John here?	A: No, he isn't.
Q: Are your books here?	A: No, they aren't.

Q:	Are you ready?	A:	No, I'm not.
Q:	Have you eaten?	A:	No, I haven't.
Q:	Have I eaten?	A:	No, you haven't.
Q:	Has he eaten?	A:	No, he hasn't.
Q:	Did you eat yet?	A:	No, I didn't.
Q:	Does he eat candy?	A:	No, he doesn't.
Q:	Do they like candy?	A:	No, they don't.

Later, standard forms can be worked into drills in which they are not the final word in a response to a question. For some speakers, a further problem with the forms of *be* is the omission of *am*, *is*, and *are* before predicate nominatives ("She a good girl"); before adjectives ("She happy"); before participles ("He listening to you"); and before past participles ("The dish broken"). For all these, omission is more common when the first word of the clause is a pronoun. In informal speech these verb forms are contracted with the preceding pronoun, or noun, thus giving:

I'm	/aIm/			
you're	/yur/			
he's	/hiz/	she's /šiz/	it's /Its/	the boy's /bɔiz/
we're	/wir/			
they're	/ðɛr/	the boys're /bɔiz r/ etc.		

In practicing to avoid the omission of forms of *to be*, the teacher should be careful to use these natural contracted forms, and not the full forms:

I am	/aI æm/
you are	/yu ar/
he is	/hi Iz/
we are	/wi ar/
they are	/ðe ar/

The fact that *you're*, *we're*, and *they're*, not to mention *your*, and *their*, end with /r/ is a good instance of the overlapping between phonological and grammatical features. While many standard speakers omit the final /r/ in a word like *their*, they substitute /ə/ for it and in the contractions as well, so that *they're* becomes /ðeə/. Nonstandard speakers may not have the /ə/ either in *their* or in the contractions. While there are grammatical consequences in some nonstandard speech, the omission of these forms of *to be* and the use of *they* for *their* and *you* for *your* should make one consider whether some attention should not be given to the pronunciation of the final *r*.

Since the contracted form of *has* becomes /s, z, Iz/ just like the contracted forms of *is* ("The cat's had kittens;" "The dog's been fed;" "The watch's been fixed."), some speakers omit this ending just as they would the contracted forms of *be* ("he eaten"), and further use a form of *be* rather than *have* in questions ("Is the dog been fed?" for "Has the dog been fed?"). Here again the first type of drill might be those in which the forms of *have* are the last in the answer to a question:

Q:	Has he eaten?	A:	Yes, he has.

The reduction of *have* in contractions is more complicated. Here many speakers of standard English use both "I been" and "I've been," "You been" and "You've been" in informal speech: since /v/ is articulated in a position similar to that of /b/, it is easily assimilated when /b/ follows. Those whose writing reflects this assimilation need to learn the practices of writing. Others may need drills of the type described for the omission of the forms of *be* and *have*.

The forms of *be* have one problem shared by no other verb: in its past tense there is one form, *was*, for *I*, *he*, *she*, and *it*, and singular nouns, and another, *were*, for *we*, *they*, and plural nouns. No other verb thus distinguishes between singular and plural preterit forms. The pressures for preterit and past participle have also tended to simplify the distinction in the preterit between *was* and *were*, most often with the result that *was* is used both for singular and plural--"he was" and "we was." Here contrastive drills may be useful: "He was in the library, but they were in the gym." "The teacher was in her office, but the students were in the field."

Adjectives and Adverbs

Problems with the use of adjectives and adverbs are of two kinds: those having to do with the formation of the comparative and superlative degrees and those having to do with the use of an adjective in places where adverbs conventionally appear.

The only inflectional endings for adjectives and adverbs are *-er* and *-est*, both derived from related Old English endings. Today, generally speaking, adjectives of two or fewer syllables in the base use these endings: *hot*, *hotter*, *hottest*; *hungry*, *hungrier*, *hungriest*. But there are exceptions: *useful* is compared with more and most; and *unlikely*, with its prefix, can use the suffixes. Some adjectives, generally those with three or more syllables, use only *more* and *most* for comparison, *beautiful* and *natural* for example. And some adjectives can be compared either way, like *likely*.

While most adverbs of manner are compared by using *more* and *most*--*more quietly*, *most quickly*--some few use *-er* and *-est* in standard English, *fast* for example. Owing to historical changes the adverbial ending these words once had has disappeared, leaving an adverb identical in form with the adjective. *Slow* is another of this group of adverbs, but here an alternative form with *-ly* has developed. In some positions in a sentence *slowly* must be used: "Slowly he left the room." In other constructions one has a choice: "Drive slow" and "Drive slowly."

The principal problem with these inflectional endings is combining them with the use of *more* or *most*, giving the double comparative or superlative: *more hungrier*, *most happiest*. These were standard in an earlier time--Shakespeare's "most unkindest cut of all" is an example--but today they are regarded as nonstandard.

In some parts of the country present participles are compared with *-er* and *-est*: "He is the lovingest child in the family" and "They are the eatingest boys I ever saw." More generally such forms are used only for deliberate stylistic effects. Past participles too are compared with *more* and *most*: "The most read book in the house." (*Damnedest* is an exception.)

The other general problem with adjectives and adverbs is the use of an adjective where standard English would choose an adverb, resulting in such constructions as "The grass grew rapid after the rain" and "He dances bad." Three pairs of words present special grammatical and stylistic problems in making this choice between adjective and adverb. They are the intensives *real/really* and *sure/surely* and *good/well*, all very commonly used words. As an exclamation, the form *sure* as in "Sure I want to ride with you" is entirely standard informal usage, as it is in most informal situations. In other words, the use of *sure* for *surely* is generally a stylistic matter. The choice between *real* and *really* when the syntax calls for an adverb is somewhat similar in standard English. Again it is a matter of style, though *real* is used somewhat less often as an adverb than *sure* is. In highly informal situations such sentences as "That was sure some party" and "He did a real bang-up job" would be entirely appropriate. With these pairs the difference between standard and nonstandard English is in command of styles rather than in the observance of a grammatical rule that the *-ly* form must be used wherever the syntax calls for an adverb.

The pair *good/well*, adverbs of manner, is somewhat different. *Well* is of course an adjective in English, and sentences like "He looks well" and "A well person is happier than a sick one" are entirely standard. The problem arises with the use of *good* as an adverb; "he did good" would surely be judged adversely. When the choice between adjective and adverb form is a problem, drills might be developed with special emphasis on the choice after the verb *do*: "he did well, he did it poorly," etc.

It is questionable whether work on the pair "feel *bad/badly*" is worthwhile. Both are now unquestionably standard. The verbs *feel*, *smell*, *sound*, *taste*, and *look* when used as linking verbs ("Dinner smells good," "The grass looks good this year") usually are followed by adjectives. But *feel badly* has come into widespread and standard use as the result of a feeling that after a verb a form with *-ly* may be preferable.

Syntax

It is easier to find features of morphology in which nonstandard speech differs from standard than it is features of syntax. Perhaps the syntactic differences may be summed up by saying that nonstandard speech often lacks the richness of constructions available in the language. Sentences may be limited to a restricted number of basic patterns. They may be short and have fewer modifying elements such as dependent clauses or appositives. The cause-effect relationship may be expressed only by because rather than by such alternatives as since, so that, for, therefore, and thus (not all these are stylistically comparable). Sentences of the type beginning only when or not until are rare, and you rather than one is used almost exclusively as an indefinite pronoun.

Some few syntactic problems may be pointed out, however. One of these is agreement of subject and verb when other elements intervene between them in a sentence, as in "One of the many things lacking are adequate recreational facilities" and "The lines of communication between teacher and student is very thin."

A related problem is agreement in number between pronoun and its noun or pronoun antecedent: "If one was given the opportunity to plan these reforms, they would have to know..." "Under these circumstances a student would not only learn the subject matter, but they would also learn how to teach it."

The word person causes many problems of this kind: "A person cannot be successful if they do not have the right qualities." "A person should be given freedom to put their ideals into effect." "A person may have the ability to answer questions but not be a success to themselves." Many of these uses of person or a similar noun in what purports to be more or less formal usage occur where a more experienced speaker or writer would use one. Indeed, the inability to substitute pronouns for nouns in a flexible and clear manner is a characteristic of much poor writing.

The formation of direct and indirect quotations, especially questions, and the transform of one into the other raises a number of syntactic questions. To convert "John asked, 'Mary, did you go to the movie last night?'" into an indirect question will result in "John asked Mary whether (or if) she had gone to the movie last night." Involved are changes in word order--replacing question order with that of declarative sentences--changes in tense--from did go to had gone--the introduction of whether or if--and in writing, changes in punctuation. Small wonder that some users of English never master this pattern and instead always compromise with what is called an incompletely converted indirect question: "John asked Mary did she go to the movies last night." Here the pronoun is changed from you to she, but the word order is that of questions. Similarly, "The plan of action would involve in what ways could the schools prove beneficial." For many such speakers the use of whether in a sentence like "He asked whether the book was available" just does not occur.

Yet it would be inaccurate to say that the use of these incompletely converted indirect quotations is confined to nonstandard English: they occur in the speech of those with impeccable social and educational backgrounds. What is true is that these latter speakers have the ability to use the completely converted question and do so, whereas many nonstandard speakers are not able.

It is difficult to determine how much stress should be put on this feature. A sentence like "The governor asked could he depend on his supporters" has no place in writing. And the successful transform in a test of "Mary said that she expected to finish my work promptly" (or vice versa) is an excellent indicator of a student's command of English. The teacher will need to weigh this against other problems. In developing teaching materials, it is simplest to start with quotations which are not questions. To change "Mary said, 'I'm hungry'" into an indirect quotation results in "Mary said that she was hungry"--a less complex process than changing "Mary said, 'Fred, are you hungry?'" into "Mary asked Fred whether he was hungry." It should be noted that while forms of say can be used to introduce direct quotations containing questions, they cannot be used in indirect quotations, and forms of another verb like ask must be substituted.

Noun and adjective clauses present another set of problems. Some English nouns can be followed by either type of clause: "His assertion that he was the Dauphin was not believed" and "The last assertion which he made was not believed." Here the first sentence contains the noun clause "that he was the Dauphin" with *that* acting as a conjunction and having no grammatical role in the clause itself. In the second sentence "which he made" is an adjective clause with *which* (or *that* or zero, both of which could serve as substitutes) acting as the direct object of *made*. Many of these nouns have to do with mental or verbal activity.

Other English nouns, however, can be followed only by adjective clauses, in which the relative word (or zero) has a grammatical function within the clause. *Man*, *boy*, and *city* are in this latter class. Thus one can say "Chicago is a city in which one can see extremes of wealth and poverty" but not "Chicago is a city that one can see extremes of wealth and poverty in it" for in the second example *that* has no role within the clause. In a related type of problem the word *that* is omitted: "Chicago is the only large city you can walk from extremes of wealth to poverty in a few minutes."

Sometimes this incorrect use of a noun clause introduced by *that* occurs where *whose* would be expected; and one finds "He's the boy that his father made him get a paper route" rather than "He's the boy whose father made him get a paper route." *Whose* is virtually nonexistent in relative clauses for many users of English.

The use of zero as the relative word in adjective clauses raises a further question. Its use is perfectly standard in speech in clauses like "A man I know" or "The man you spoke to." In writing the former would perhaps be unchanged, and the latter would almost certainly be rephrased so that the clause did not end with a preposition. Generally the zero relative is direct object or object of a preposition, and almost always the word opening the adjective clause is a personal pronoun or proper noun. Nonstandard English has one use of this relative not shared by standard English--its use as a subject, as in "My friend lives down the street has a new car." While such constructions are most common in speech, they are also found in writing.

The repetition of the conjunction *that* when used to introduce noun clauses is also a problem, as in "The story presents the idea that if a person is well educated that he will be able to associated with anyone." These repeated *that*'s occur when an intervening element, here the words "if a person is well educated," come at the beginning of the noun clause.

A further problem with *that* is its replacement by *until* in *so* ... *that* constructions. Thus "His arguments were so persuasive that he convinced even some of his enemies" becomes "His arguments were so persuasive until he convinced even some of his enemies." Again, the construction with *until* is an old one.

Sentences beginning with *there* are familiar for the questions of subject-verb agreement which they raise, with "there is" often being found where "there are" is called for by the following plural subject. A different problem is the replacement of *there* by *it* in sentences where the word *there* fills an empty "slot" in the sentence and serves largely to signal that the word order is not that of a question. The result is such sentences as "It's a man at the door" not in response to the question "Who's there?" and "It's some children playing outside, again not in response to a question. Here too the construction with *it* is the continuation of an older English usage.

The overuse of the historical present in relating past events ("So he walks into the room and sits down.") is often a characteristic of nonstandard speech, sometimes with the further mark of the third-person singular *-s* being added to other verbs ("I says to him;" "Says you!"). Such constructions are rare in writing but are often noted in speech, especially when the *-s* ending is misplaced.

A few more limited points of syntax might be mentioned. One is the use of *done* to indicate completed action, as in "I done told you that I wasn't going to be home till late." Here *done* has something of the sense of *already*.

Another is the use of *whereby* in constructions where *whereas* is meant: "He intended to advance his cause, whereby all he succeeded in doing was to weaken it." *Whereby* is also misused for *so that*: "He went into the city whereby he could apply for his passport."

Irregular or Troublesome Verbs

Most of the verbs we list here are irregular. Not all of them are troublesome, but we have retained even those that are not because it is often convenient for a teacher to have a list of irregular verbs at hand. Some of the verbs listed are regular but are given irregular forms by some speakers. Others are troublesome in various ways that will appear from the items in the list.

The irregular verbs used most frequently in everyday life are those that are already best mastered by the students. This will vary from person to person and from community to community, but if one considers only errors in forms and not errors in spelling, the following verbs will probably cause the least trouble:

bet
blow
broadcast
buy
come
cut
dig
do
draw
drive
fight
find
fly
forecast
freeze
get
give
go
grow
hit
hold
hurt
knit
know
learn
leave
let
make
quit
read
say
see
sell
sew
show
shut
smell
spell
spill
stick
sweat
teach
tell
throw
understand
wed
win

A class of disadvantaged college freshmen will get about 90 to 95 percent of the forms of the following verbs right if spelling errors are not counted:

alight
awaken
bend
beseech
bite
break
burn
burst
catch
choose
cleave
dare
deal
drink
dwell
eat
fall
feel
fit
fling
foretell
forget
forgive
hang
hear
heave
hide
kneel
lean
leap
lose
mean
meet
mow
pen
plead
prove
rend
ride
saw
send
shear
shine[2]
shred
sing
sleep
sow
spend
split
spoil
spring
stand
steal
sting
sweat
take
tear
think
thrive
undergo
undertake
waken
wear
wet
withstand
write

The same group would get about 80 to 90 percent of the forms of the following verbs right:

abide
arise
befall
begin
behold
bereave
bleed
blend
bring
build
cleave (to)
cling
cost
dive
dream
feed
foresee
gild
keep
lay
lend
ring
rise
run
set
shake
shave
shoot
shrink
sink
sit
sling
speak
speed
spit
spread
stink
strike
sting
swell
swim
weave
wind

---

[2] The superscript indicates the second shine in the main list.

Errors in verb forms will be more numerous for the following:

awake
bear
beget
bid
bind
breed
cast
chide
clothe
cost
creep
drag
fell
flee
flow
forbear
forbid
forsake
gird
grave
grind
hang (a man)*
hew
lade
lead
lie
light
put
rid
ring[2]
seek
shed
shine[1]
shoe
slay
slide
slink
slit
smite
spin
spit
stave in
stave off
strew
stride
strive
sweep
swing
thrust
tread
wake
weep
wring

Some of the words in the list just above are not much needed in everyday life. The teacher must judge how much time to give to them in the light of the potentialities of the student and his expectations for a career. Probably nothing is gained by drilling a student in the use of words he is never going to need.

In the master list which follows we have listed the accepted forms in capital letters. The forms in lower case listed below the accepted forms are those that have been elicited from culturally disadvantaged students by tests given in the freshman year in college. They are listed in descending order of frequency. A few common dialect forms have been added from the records of the Linguistic Atlas of America.

Where there is more than one acceptable form, the first form listed is perhaps somewhat more frequent than the second. We have put () around one or more forms. The () mean that the form so enclosed is not as frequent in the United States as the one not so enclosed. The form is acceptable but should not be encouraged.

ABIDE	ABIDED, ABODE*	ABIDED, ABODE*
	abide	abide
	abid	abiden
		abidden

*Abide is used more often in the sense 'dwell' than in other senses.

ALIGHT	ALIGHTED, ALIT	ALIGHTED, ALIT
	alight	alight
		alitten
ARISE	AROSE	ARISEN
	arosed	arose
		risen
		rose
		arosen
ASK	ASKED	ASKED
	ask	ask
	axed	axed

---

*If only hanged is accepted for preterit and participle; otherwise it will appear in the final block of verbs. (We have placed an * after a form about which there is something more to be said. It is said immediately after the cited forms rather than postponed to the foot of the page or the end of the list. Sometimes the comment is merely "Archaic." This term means that some time ago the form was accepted but now appears to be old-fashioned or even literary, so that its use in speech and writing should be discouraged.)

AWAKE	AWOKE, (AWAKED) awake awoken	AWAKED, (AWOKE or AWOKEN)* awaken waken

*The participles with *o* are common in Great Britain but not in the United States. When students are tested for their knowledge of the principal parts of *awake*, *awaken*, *wake*, and *waken*, there will be a mixture of forms. This need cause no concern as long as accepted forms of these verbs are used in the right slot, since the meaning will be clear. It would be a waste of time to drill students so that they could separate these verbs.

AWAKEN*	AWAKENED awake	AWAKENED

*See note to *Awake*

BEAR	BORE beared	BORNE bore born* boren beared borned bear

*Since the adjective *born* is much more frequent in speech than the participle *borne* and since both words are pronounced the same, it is not surprising that *born* slips into the verb forms.

BEFALL	BEFELL befalled befall	BEFALLEN befell befelled befellen
BEGET	BEGOT begetted beget begat begoted	BEGOTTEN, (BEGOT) begetted begat beget
BEGIN	BEGAN begun begin	BEGUN began
BEHOLD	BEHELD beheld ed behold beholded	BEHELD behold beholden beheld ed beholded
BEND	BENT bend	BENT bended
BEREAVE	BEREAVED, BEREFT bereave beraved	BEREAVED, BEREFT bereave bereaven
BESEECH	BESEECHED, BESOUGHT beseech	BESEECHED, BESOUGHT beseech
BET	BET, BETTED	BET, (BETTED) betten

BID*	BADE bid bidded baded	BIDDEN, BID bade bidded biden baded badden

*In the sense 'bid goodbye,' etc. Some students pronounce bade like bayed instead of like bad, the usual pronunciation.

BID*	BID bided bade bidden	BID bidden bidded baden

*As at an auction or at bridge.

BIND	BOUND binded bind	BOUND binded bind bounded bonded
BITE	BIT bite	BITTEN bite bit
BLEED	BLED blead bleed bleeded	BLED bleed blead bleded
BLEND	BLENDED, (BLENT)	BLENDED, (BLENT)
BLOW	BLEW blowed blewed	BLOWN blowen blowen blowed blewed
BOIL	BOILED boilt	BOILED boilt
BREAK	BROKE	BROKEN broke
BREED	BRED breed breeded bredded	BRED breed breeded breded breaden
BRING	BROUGHT brang brung	BROUGHT brung bought
BROADCAST	BROADCAST (BROADCASTED) broadcassed	BROADCAST,(BROADCASTED) broadcassed
BUILD	BUILT builded* build	BUILT builded* build

*Archaic

BURN	BURNED, (BURNT)* burn	BURNED, (BURNT)* burn

*More common in British than in American usage.

BURST	BURST bursted	BURST bursted
BUST*	BUSTED bust	BUSTED bust

*Standard only in informal spoken English and its likes.

BUY	BOUGHT	BOUGHT boughten*

*Perhaps acceptable, in such phrases as "boughten bread," but not as the past participle in verb phrases like "had bought."

CAST	CAST casted	CAST casted
CATCH	CAUGHT catched ketched kitched cotch	CAUGHT catched ketched kitched cotch
CHIDE	CHIDED, (CHID)* chide chidded	CHIDED, (CHID, CHIDDEN)* chide chidded

*More common in British than in American usage.

CHOOSE	CHOSE choose	CHOSEN choosen chose
CLEAVE*	CLEAVED, CLEFT, (CLOVE) cleave cleaven	CLEAVED, CLEFT, (CLOVE, CLOVEN) cleave cleaven claved

*'split'

CLEAVE*	CLEAVED cleave cleft	CLEAVED cleave cleaven cleft

*'adhere'

CLIMB	CLIMBED climb clim clom	CLIMBED climb clim clom
CLING	CLUNG clang clinged	CLUNG clinged clang

CLOTHE	CLOTHED, CLAD clothe clothen	CLOTHED, CLAD clothe clothen
COME	CAME come	COME came
COST	COST costed	COST costed
COST*	COSTED	COSTED

*A verb used in business and governmental circles meaning 'to estimate the cost of (a project etc.).'

CREEP	CREPT creeped crep* crepted	CREPT creeped crepted crep*

*Reflects pronunciation

CUT	CUT	CUT cutten
DARE	DARED dare	DARED dare
DEAL	DEALT dealed deal dole	DEALT dealed deal
DIG	DUG digged*	DUG duggen

*Archaic

DIVE	DIVED, (DOVE) div duv	DIVED, (DOVE) doven diven div duv
DO	DID done	DONE did
DRAW	DREW drow drawed	DRAWN drew drowen drawed
DRAG	DRAGGED drug drag drought	DRAGGED drug draggen
DREAM	DREAMED, (DREAMPT)* dream dremp drimpt drimp	DREAMED, (DREAMPT)* dream dremp drimpt drimp

*More common in British than in American usage.

DRINK	DRANK drink dranked drunk	DRUNK, (DRANK) drinken
DRIVE	DROVE driv druv drived drive	DRIVEN drove driv druv drived drive
DROWN	DROWNED drownded	DROWNED drownded
DWELL	DWELT, (DWELLED) dwell	DWELT, (DWELLED) dwell dwellen
EAT	ATE eat eaten et	EATEN ate eat et
FALL	FELL fall	FALLEN fell fellen
FEED	FED feed	FED feed feeden
FEEL	FELT feeled feel	FELT feeled feel
FELL	FELLED fell falled	FELLED fallen fell felt fellen feeled
FETCH	FETCHED fotch	FETCHED fotch
FIGHT	FOUGHT fit fout	FOUGHT foughten fight fit fout
FIND	FOUND	FOUND
FIT	FIT, (FITTED)*	FITTED, (FIT)

*Certain senses require *fitted*, as in "His tailor fitted him for a suit" or "His studies fitted him for his career."

FLEE	FLED fleed flew flee	FLED fleed fleen flown flee fleeded flew
FLING	FLUNG flang	FLUNG flang
FLOW	FLOWED flew flown flow	FLOWED flown flowen flowned
FLY	FLEW	FLOWN flowen flew
FORBEAR	FORBORE forbeared forbear forborn forbearen	FORBORNE forbeared forbear forborn forbored forbearen
FORBID	FORBADE forbid forbidded	FORBIDDEN forbid forbade forbidded forbaden
FORECAST	FORECAST, FORECASTED	FORECAST, FORECASTED
FORESEE	FORESAW foreseen foresought	FORESEEN forsaw foresought
FORETELL	FORETOLD foretole*	FORETOLD foretell foretollen foretoll* foretole*

*These spellings reflect the students' pronunciation.

FORGET	FORGOT forget	FORGOTTEN forgot forgetten
FORGIVE	FORGAVE forgiven	FORGIVEN forgave forgive
FORSAKE	FORSOOK forsaked forsake forsaken forsought forsuke forsok	FORSAKEN forsaked

FREEZE	FROZE freezed frozed friz	FROZEN froze freezed frozed friz
GET	GOT	GOT, (GOTTEN)*

*Heard more often in speech than seen in print. Accepted in speech but usually edited out of writing.

GILD	GILDED, GILT gild gilted	GILDED, GILT gild gilden gilted
GIRD	GIRDED, (GIRT) gird girdled	GIRDED, (GIRT) gird girdled
GIVE	GAVE give giv	GIVEN gave give giv
GO	WENT	GONE
GRAVE	GRAVED engraved grave ingraved graven ingrave engrave	GRAVEN, GRAVED engraved grave
GRIND	GROUND grinded grind grounded grund	GROUND grinded grounded grind grund grown
GROW	GREW grow growed	GROWN grew growed
HANG*	HUNG hang hanged	HUNG hanged

*a picture, etc.

HANG*	HANGED, (HUNG) hang	HANGED, (HUNG) hang

*a man. Hanged is considered the prestigious form but hung is growing. Drill in this distinction is probably not worthwhile.

HEAR	HEARD heared head	HEARD heared head

HEAT	HEATED het	HEATED het
HEAVE	HEAVED, HOVE* heave	HEAVED, HOVE* heave heaven hoven

*Confined to nautical contexts, as "The schooner hove to for the night."

HELP	HELPED holp	HELPED holp
HEW	HEWED hew heown	HEWED, HEWN hewen hew
HIDE	HID hide	HIDDEN hid hide
HIT	HIT hitted	HIT hitten
HOLD	HELD helded	HELD helded
HURT	HURT	HURT
KEEP	KEPT keep keept	KEPT keep keept
KNEEL	KNELT, KNEELED kneel	KNELT, KNEELED kneel
KNIT	KNIT, KNITTED	KNIT, KNITTED knitten
KNOW	KNEW knowed	KNOWN knowed
LADE	LADED lade laden ladened loaded	LADEN, (LADED) lade ladened ladden loaded
LAY	LAID lay	LAID lain
LEAD	LED lead	LED lead leaded
LEAN	LEANED lean leanded	LEANED lean leanded
LEAP	LEAPED (LEAPT) leap	LEAPED (LEAPT) leap
LEARN	LEARNED (LEARNT) learn	LEARNED (LEARNT) learn

LEAVE	LEFT lef*	LEFT lef*

*Reflects pronunciation.

LEND	LENT loaned* lended lend loan loanded lond	LENT lended loaned* loan loanded lend

*Apt enough in meaning, though borrowed from the verb loan, which has been growing in popularity in the past decades.

LET	LET	LET
LIE	LAY laid lied lie	LAIN laid lay lied
LIGHT	LIT, LIGHTED	LIT, LIGHTED lighten
LOSE	LOST losed	LOST lose losed losted
MAKE	MADE	MADE
MEAN	MEANT mean	MEANT mean
MEET	MET meet	MET meet
MOW	MOWED mow	MOWED, MOWN mowen mowned
PEN	PENNED (PENT)* pen	PENNED (PENT)* pen

*Of course not possible in the sense of 'wrote/written,' as in "He penned a letter."

PLEAD	PLEADED, PLED plead	PLEADED, PLED plead
PROVE	PROVED prove	PROVED (PROVEN) provened
PUT	PUT	PUT
QUIT	QUIT (QUITTED)*	QUIT (QUITTED)*

*Now used only in special contexts, as in "He claimed he had quitted the premises before October 1."

READ	READ red	READ red

RENT	RENT, (RENDED) rend rought	RENT, (RENDED) rend
RETREAD*	RETREADED	RETREADED

*a tire

RID	RID (RIDDED) rode	RID (RIDDED) ridden
RIDE	RODE rid	RIDDEN rode rid
RING*	RANG rung rong	RUNG rand

*a bell etc.

RING*	RINGED ring rang ring	RINGED rung rang ring

*'draw a ring around'

RISE	ROSE rise raise raised rised	RISEN rose raise rised raisen
RUN	RAN run	RUN ran runned
SAW	SAWED saw	SAWED, SAWN saw sawned
SAY	SAID*	SAID*

*Sometimes mispronounced as "sayed."

SCARE	SCARED scairt	SCARED scairt
SEE	SAW seen see seed	SEEN saw see seed
SEEK	SOUGHT seeked sook soke seek	SOUGHT seeked seek sook seeken
SELL	SOLD	SOLD

SEND	SENT send sended	SENT send sended
SET	SET sat sit	SET sat sit
SEW	SEWED sew sowed sown	SEWN, SEWED sown sowen sowed sawn
SHAKE	SHOOK shoke shoken	SHAKEN shook
SHAVE	SHAVED shaven*	SHAVED shaven*

*Used only as an adjective, as in "a clean-shaven fellow."

SHEAR	SHEARED shear	SHEARED, SHORN* shoren

*Shorn is used chiefly in figurative senses.

SHED	SHED shedded	SHED shedded shedden
SHINE*	SHONE shined shown	SHONE shined shown shoned shune

*as the sun does

SHINE*	SHINED shine shone	SHINED shine shone

*shoes, silver

SHOE	SHOD shoed shoe	SHOD shoed shoe shodden
SHOOT	SHOT shoot	SHOT shoot
SHOW	SHOWED	SHOWN (SHOWED)
SHRED	SHREDDED (SHRED)	SHREDDED (SHRED) shreden
SHRINK	SHRANK (SHRUNK) shrinked	SHRUNK shrunken shrinken shrinked shrank

SHUT	SHUT	SHUT
SING	SANG (SUNG) song	SUNG sang song
SINK	SANK (SUNK) sinked	SUNK (SUNKEN) sinked
SIT	SAT sit set sot	SAT sit set sitten sot
SLAY	SLEW slayed slay slain	SLAIN slayed slew slayed slewed slewn slown
SLEEP	SLEPT sleep slep* sleap	SLEPT sleep slep* sleap

*Pronunciation spellings.

SLIDE	SLID slide slided sled	SLID slidden* slide sled

*Archaic

SLING	SLUNG slang slinged slanged	SLUNG slinged slunk
SLINK	SLUNK slinked slank slinken	SLUNK slinked slank slinken
SLIT	SLIT slitted	SLIT slitted slite slitten
SMELL	SMELLED (SMELT) smell	SMELLED (SMELT) smell
SMITE	SMOTE smited smite smit smitten smoted smate	SMITTEN smited smite smitted smiten smit smute smote smoten

SOW	SOWED sow sew	SOWN, SOWED sowen
SPEAK	SPOKE	SPOKEN spoke
SPEED*	SPED speeded speed	SPED speeded

*down the road, path

SPEED*	SPEEDED	SPEEDED

*up the motor, the car

SPELL	SPELLED (SPELT)* spell	SPELLED (SPELT)* spellen spell

*Chiefly British.

SPEND	SPENT spend	SPENT spend
SPILL	SPILLED (SPILT) spill	SPILLED (SPILT)
SPIN	SPUN spinned span spon spint spunned spin	SPUN spinned spon spint spunned spin
SPIT*	SPIT, SPAT spitted spitten	SPIT, SPAT spitten spitted

*'expectorate' etc.

SPIT*	SPITTED spit spited spat	SPITTED spit spited spiten

*'pierce'

SPLIT	SPLIT splitted	SPLIT splitted splitten
SPOIL	SPOIL (SPOILT) spoil spolld	SPOILED (SPOILT) spilt spolled
SPREAD	SPREAD spreaded	SPREAD spreaded

SPRING	SPRANG, SPRUNG sprank	SPRUNG sprang sprunk sprong
STAND	STOOD stand stode	STOOD stand stode
STAVE (in)	STOVE (STAVED) stave stoved staven	STOVE (STAVED) staven stoven stave stived stoved
STAVE (off)	STAVED (STOVE) stave stoved staven	STAVED (STOVE) staven stoved
STEAL	STOLE stoled	STOLEN stole stoled stolden
STICK	STUCK stucked	STUCK
STING	STUNG stang stanged	STUNG stunged
STINK	STANK, STUNK stinked	STUNK stinked stank
STREW	STREWED strew strewn straw strow strew	STREWED, STREWN strown strew strewen strowen strawn
STRIDE	STRODE strided stroded strolled strude stride	STRIDDEN strode strided strolled stroded stride stroden
STRIKE	STRUCK stroke struke	STRUCK, STRICKEN* stroke struke striken stroken strock

*Stricken is used only in certain contexts, such as "stricken from the record, stricken by disease," etc.

STRING	STRUNG strang stringed strong	STRUNG strang
STRIVE	STROVE strived	STRIVEN strove strived
SWEAR	SWORE sweared	SWORN swore swuren swaren sweared
SWEAT	SWEAT, SWEATED*	SWEAT, SWEATED* sweaten

*Sweated is required in such contexts as "He sweated it out until the examination results were announced" and "The hoodlums sweated the truth out of him."

SWEEP	SWEPT sweep swep* sweept	SWEPT sweep swep* sweept sweeped swepten swepted

*Pronunciation spellings.

SWELL	SWELLED swoll swell swoled swollen	SWELLED, SWOLLEN* swell swellen swolden swoled swoll

*Swollen is used more often after be than after have, as in "The river was swollen after the spring rains."

SWIM	SWAM swom swum swimmed swammed swim	SWUM swam swom swimmed swim
SWING	SWUNG swang swing	SWUNG swang
TAKE	TOOK taken take tuck taked	TAKEN took tuck takened taked
TEACH	TAUGHT teached	TAUGHT teached
TEAR	TORE	TORN tore

TELL	TOLD tolded toll*	TOLD toll*

*Pronunciation spellings.

THRIVE	THROVE, THRIVED thrive	THRIVEN, THRIVED throve
THINK	THOUGHT	THOUGHT
THROW	THREW throwed thrown	THROWN throwen throwed
THRUST	THRUST thrusted	THRUST thrusted
TREAD*	TROD treaded tread trodded	TRODDEN, TROD treaded tread treaden

*'step'

TREAD*	TREADED	TREADED

*water "He treaded water till the canoe reached him."

UNDERGO	UNDERWENT undergone undergoed	UNDERGONE underwent undergoned
UNDERSTAND	UNDERSTOOD	UNDERSTOOD
UNDERTAKE	UNDERTOOK undertake undertaken	UNDERTAKEN undertook
WAKE	WOKE, (WAKED)	WAKED (WOKEN, WOKE)* waken awaken wake

*The participles in o are common in Great Britain, but not in the United States. When students are tested on their knowledge of the principal parts of awake, awaken, wake, and waken, there will be a mixture of forms. This need cause no concern as long as accepted forms of these verbs are used in the right slot, since the meaning will be clear. It would be a waste of time to drill students so that they could separate these verbs.

WAKEN*	WAKENED	WAKENED

*see note to wake.

WEAVE*	WOVE weaved weave	WOVEN wove weaved weaven weave

*cloth etc.

WEAVE*	WEAVED	WEAVED

*For such figurative uses as "The boy weaved his way through the bushes."

WEAR	WORE	WORN wore
WED	WEDDED (WED)	WEDDED (WED)
WEEP	WEPT weeped wep* weep wepted	WEPT weeped wep* wepted weep

*Pronunciation spellings

WET	WET, WETTED	WET, WETTED wetten
WIN	WON	WON woned
WIND	WOUND wond wind wounded	WOUND wond winded
WITHSTAND	WITHSTOOD withstanded withstode	WITHSTOOD withstode withstand withstanded
WRING	WRUNG wrang wring wrong	WRUNG wrang wringed wrong
WRITE	WROTE writ	WRITTEN wrote writ

SPEECH SAMPLES OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

N. Louanna Furbee
Emily Pettigrew Morris
Dagna Simpson

The speech samples which are given here are transcriptions of tape-recorded interviews with students of various schools in the city of Chicago. The interviews were conducted as informally as possible, and the informants were aware that the conversations were being taped. Informants were generally asked to tell something about themselves, their schools, their homes, or their friends.

A modified orthographic transcription of the taped interviews is presented here. These recorded samples of speech exemplify phonological, morphological, and syntactic differences from standard English.

Puerto Rican girl, age 13 (in Chicago 1 year)

I say their names. The first is Ginovar Aguilar. She _tiene_ (has) let's see...she _tiene_ (has) five children. The other one is Coranácion Serra. She _tiene_ (has) two children. I don't see another one of his. I see any more but two. Let's see. Ginovar Aguilar is in New York. She speaks English. Yes...yes. I don't see...let's see...I don't see any more but one children of her. Any more. But the other I see the two childrens. Yes...no...let's see. One have...let's see...one have ten years...ten years old. Her name is Lupita or Guadalupe. The other is Esto Flores..Esto. He has...he had a thirt-...no, fourteen...Aunts ...He work in the factory. My mother work...my mother is the wife house...the wife house... house wife.

Kentucky boy, age 10 (in Chicago 1 year)

They ain't got no ponies; they got big horses. ...I rode one, real big uns. Scare me. ...I had a pony. I could ride hit real good--a little pony. ...Ouno (I don't know)...Yeh we had one...See his really named Frankie. When you call him Peanut, he'll buck ye. ...He will. Ya say, get up Peanut, den he'll say, yonk, shuum! ...I ont know. ...A red one. ...And it had a slick back, it goes mmn, like kat. ...He got down 'n wallered wif me. See he started to lay down an when he started wallerin I got off. Wif dis new saddle, he tore dis new saddle off. My father got mad. He wentnt down 'n got wallered wif this new saddle. Me on him too. But I got off. ...I know. He did dat to my cousin too, and she hopped off like everything. She wouldn't get on him no more.

When I was sleepin one night...'n...over my Maama's. And 'na ders sompin, ers some police dogs--we was on the farm den--ders some police dogs up in the woods was gittin our chickens. One night I thought they was in the cellar gittin Pa's pig meat, we left in the cellar. So I got real scared 'n woke my Pa up 'n told him to go out in the cellar and see what it was. And he...and he went in ner 'n it wunt nothin 'n he looked over a pig pen. It was the pigs rootin in na--it was the corn. Scared me to death!

Negro girl, age 14 (Memphis)

English. Our teacher when we firs got in here "I haven't got a pe." Girl sittin nex to me. She a teacher's daughter. Teachers always like the teacher's daughter over the other children, expecially if the teacher go--is a teacher at that school. Her mama was a teacher dere las year. This year she teach at another school. She si righ nex to me. So she so stingy. I have some candy uh sumpin, she'll as me for some and I don't be wantin to give it to her, but I'll go on and give it to her and so nen one day she as me how de spell a lil ole simple word. Wha was that word? It star with a 'S'. It was scot, I think. SCOT. She didn't know how to spell it, and I tol her. It was on a cross word puzzle. An nen I axed her for sompin. Naw, the girl sittin on the other side of me named Delores. She ax her le 'er use her ink pen. She say, "After today you not gon use my ink pen anymore, you better bring your own." An so Delores gave her the ink pen bac. And nen teacher came ta'in 'bout uh "I don't have any pets in here." Eribody cin come in the room and si down. Here go Teresa, "May I go over to so and so and so and so's room?" "May I go over to so and so and so's--?" She have 'bout ten places to go when she git in that room, and teacher let her go ery place. And one day I had my brother's lunch money and I wanted to give it to him. And I tol her the reason I wanted to go and she wouldn't even le me go but--and, and she say she say couldn't nobody go and nen Teresa jes walked up there and had ten places to go and she went to all ubum, but I couldn go take my brother his lunch money. When you, when you come to the door. I 'on't say nuttin to 'um. I do my, I do my lesson and I, I sit right in front of the teachers too. Dat what I--I 'on't like to sit in front of no teacher's des. They always put my seat up dere. I be goin to the back. See she got us in alphabetical order. And nat way--. It's a round circle and den it's another round circle and nen um on the outside. Um hum. Right at her desk too. But I do my work. I do--. I'on't say nuttin to nobody hardly. She don't never have to git on me in English for doin nuttin. I 'on't never say nuttin. But Teresa. Sometimes she cin go tell Teresa, "Teresa I'm surprised at you, 'bout you doin nat." An nen she 'on't lak--she 'on't lak fur you to talk in her room and she 'on't lak fur you to chew gum. And nem chiren jes be chewing gum and chewing gum. I have my gum too. She 'on't never see me 'nough. See I can--. I can do all nis stuff and dey 'on't say nuttin. Person sit next to me be chewin, be slippin in and chew eri once in a while and she git 'em. She really git 'em.

ABBREVIATED CHECKLIST OF LEXICAL ITEMS IN DIALECTS

A. L. Davis

This fifty-item vocabulary questionnaire is an abbreviated form of the kinds of checklists which have been used extensively in the United States and Canada, primarily in a mail correspondence technique for data gathering. It has been found that with proper safeguards on the qualifications of informants the results compare favorably with those of actual field interviews.

The directions and the biographical sheets are identical with those generally used. The questionnaires normally include 100-150 items.

The items chosen for this list have been restricted to those which show some geographical distribution in the Middle West. Some variants will appear regularly in all parts of the area while others will not. Of the variants the following are usually Northern; that is, in the states bordering the Great Lakes, they are found in northern Ohio, northern Indiana, northern Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin and Michigan:

> stoop, pail, swill, spider, whiffletree or whippletree, evener, teeter, coal scuttle, comforter, co-boss (ie), chick-chick, johnnycake, fried-cake, dutch cheese, cherry and peach pit, walnut shuck, angleworm, (devil's) darning needle, crabs, sugar bush, pa, to his stomach, belly-flop (per).

The following are Midland, occupying the area south of the Northern items. Very few really Southern items are found. Some variants seem to be more common near the Ohio River; these are marked SM (for South Midland):

> evening, sunup SM, quarter till, fire-board and mantel-board SM, dogs, dog irons and firedogs, blinds, spouting and gutters, hay doodles, hay shocks SM, redd or ridd up, barn lot, bucket, slop, skillet, poke, gunny sack, tow sack SM, French harp, trestle, coal oil, comfort, nicker, pull (ey), bone, sook, chickie-chickie, a little piece, light bread, side meat, souse, smearcase, eat a piece, cherry or peach seed, cling peach, butter beans, corn shuck, roasting ears, fish (ing) worm, snake feeder, snake doctor SM, crawdad, sugar camp, paw in or on his stomach, belly buster.

The items with most sharply defined regional variants are calls to animals since there is no literary pressure brought to bear on them, as has happened with skillet which owes its now nation-wide use to advertising.

When Cassidy's Dictionary of American Regionalisms is complete, we will have a reference work showing the distributions of nearly all of our regional vocabulary. Maps for the Atlantic states of the checklist items are to be found in Kurath's Word Geography.

Abbreviated Checklist

For many things in daily life, people in different parts of the United States use different words. As Americans moved westward, they brought with them the terms used in their home states. Studies have already been made of many of the different words used in various areas of the Atlantic Seaboard, but the careful study of the Middle West is still to be completed. On the following pages are some items which were picked out as examples of these differences. Will you please help us in this study by recording your own usage?

Directions:

1. Please put a circle around the word in each group which you ordinarily use.
2. If you ordinarily use more than one word in a group, put a circle around each of the words you use.
3. Don't put a circle around any word you don't actually use, even though you may be familiar with it.
4. If the word you ordinarily use is not listed in the group, please write it in the space below the item.
5. If you never use any word in the group, because you never need to refer to the thing described, don't mark the word.
6. THE MATERIAL IN CAPITALS IS EXPLANATORY ONLY.

Example: TOWN OFFICER: selectman, [✓ trustee], supervisor, reeve, councilman.

1. THE LATTER PART OF THE DAYLIGHT HOURS BEFORE SUPPER:
afternoon, evening.

2. THE SUN APPEARS AT: sunrise, sunup.

3. A TIME OF DAY: quarter of eleven, quarter till eleven, quarter to eleven.

4. SHELF OVER FIREPLACE: fireboard, mantel, mantel board, mantelpiece, mantel shelf,
shelf, clock shelf.

5. SUPPORTS FOR LOGS IN FIREPLACE: andirons, dogs, dog irons, firedogs, fire irons,
handirons, log irons.

6. WINDOW COVERING ON ROLLERS: blinds, curtains, roller shades, shades, window blinds,
window shades.

7. DEVICES AT EDGES OF ROOF TO CARRY OFF RAIN: eaves, eaves spouts, evestroughs, gutters,
rain troughs, spouting, spouts.

8. SMALL PILES OF HAY IN THE FIELDS: cocks, doodles, hand stacks, haycocks, hay doodles,
hay shocks, hay tumbles, heaps, mows, piles, ricks, shocks, tumbles.

9. TO DO THE HOUSEWORK: clean up, do up, redd up, ridd up, straighten up, tidy up.

10. LARGE PORCH WITH ROOF: gallery, piazza, porch, portico, stoop, veranda.

SMALL PORCH, OFTEN WITH NO ROOF: platform, porch, portico, step, steps, stoop, veranda.

11. YARD ADJOINING BARN: barn lot, barn yard, cow lot, farm lot, feed lot.

12. LARGE OPEN WOODEN VESSEL FOR WATER, MILK, ETC.: pail, bucket.

LARGE OPEN TIN VESSEL FOR WATER, MILK, ETC.: pail, bucket.

13. VESSEL FOR CARRYING FOOD TO HOGS: slop bucket, slop pail, swill bucket, swill pail.

14. HEAVY IRON UTENSIL FOR FRYING: creeper, fryer, frying pan, fry pan, skillet, spider.

15. PAPER CONTAINER FOR GROCERIES, ETC.: bag, poke, sack, toot.

LARGE, LOOSELY WOVEN: burlap bag, burlap sack, coffee sack, croker sack, crocus sack, gunny sack, gunny bag, guano sack, jute bag, jute sack, seagrass sack, tow sack.

16. INSTRUMENT TO BE BLOWN ON: breath harp, French harp, harmonica, harp, Jew's harp, juice harp, mouth harp, mouth organ.

HELD BETWEEN THE TEETH AND PICKED: breath harp, French harp, Jew's harp, juice harp, mouth harp.

17. BAR TO WHICH A SINGLE HORSE IS HITCHED: singletree, swingel tree, swiveltree, whiffletree, whippletree.

BAR FOR TWO HORSES: double evener, double singletree, double swingletree, doubletree, evener, spreader.

18. IMPLEMENT (WITH A FRAME) FOR HOLDING BOARDS FOR SAWING, USED BY CARPENTERS: horse, jack, rack, sawbuck, saw horse, saw jack, trestle.

IMPLEMENT (WITH X FRAME) FOR HOLDING FIREWOOD FOR SAWING: buck, horse, jack, rack, sawbuck, saw horse, saw jack, trestle, wood buck.

19. PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT: dandle, ridy horse, seesaw, teeter, teeter board, teetering board, teetering horse, see horse, teeter-totter, tilt(s), tilting board, tinter, tinter board.

20. VESSEL FOR COAL: coal bucket, coal hod, coal pail, coal scuttle.

21. A KIND OF FUEL: carbon oil, coal oil, kerosene, lamp oil.

22. BED COVER FILLED WITH COTTON, TIED, NOT QUILTED: comfort, comfortable, comforter, hap, tied quilt.

23. GRASS STRIP BETWEEN SIDEWALK AND STREET: berm, boulevard, boulevard strip, parking, parking strip, parkway, sidewalk plot, tree lawn.

24. NAME FOR GENTLE SOUND MADE BY HORSES AT FEEDING TIME: laugh, neigh, nicker, whicker, whinker, whinny, whinner.

25. BONE FROM CHICKEN BREAST: breakbone, lucky bone, pull bone, pulley bone, pulling bone, wishbone.

26. CALL TO COWS TO GET THEM IN FROM PASTURE: boss(ie)! co-boss(ie)! come boss(ie)! co-ee! co-wench! here boss(ie)! soo! sook(ie)! sook-boss(ie)! sook-cow!

27. CALL TO HOGS AT FEEDING TIME: chook, chook! hoo-ee! piggy-piggy! pigoo-wee! poo-wee! soo-pig! soo-wee! woo-ee!

28. CALL TO CHICKENS AT FEEDING TIME: bee! biddie! chick-chick! chickie-chickie! chuck-chuck! co-chee! coo-chick! kip-kip! kit-kit! kut-kut! widdie!

29. A SHORT DISTANCE: (just) a ways, a little piece, a little way, a little ways, a piece.

30. BREAD IN LOAVES, MADE OF WHITE FLOUR: bread, light-bread, loaf bread, wheat bread, white bread, yeast bread, riz bread.

31. BREAD MADE OF CORN MEAL: corn bread, corn dodger(s), corn pone, hoe cake(s), johnnycake, pone bread.

32. ROUND, FLAT CONFECTION WITH HOLE IN CENTER, MADE WITH BAKING POWDER: crull, cruller, doughnut, fat-cake, fried cake, cake doughnut, raised doughnut.

SIMILAR CONFECTION, MADE WITH YEAST: cookie, crull, cruller, doughnut, fat-cake, fried-cake, nut cake, raised doughnut, bread doughnut.

33. MEAT FROM SIDES OF HOG, SALTED BUT NOT SMOKED: bacon, flitch, middlin, middlin meat, salt pork, side pork, side meat, sowbelly, fatback.

34. PRESSED MEAT LOAF MADE OF HOGS' JOWLS, HEAD, ETC.: head cheese, hog(s) head cheese, souse, pressed meat.

35. HOME-MADE CHEESE: clabber cheese, cottage cheese, curd cheese, curd(s), dutch cheese, home-made cheese, pot cheese, smearcase.

36. FOOD EATEN BETWEEN REGULAR MEALS: a bite, lunch, a piece, piece meal, a snack.

37. CENTER OF A CHERRY: pit, seed, stone.

38. PEACH WHOSE MEAT STICKS TO SEED: cling, cling peach, clingstone, clingstone peach, hard peach, plum-peach, press peach.

39. HARD INNER COVER OF A WALNUT: hull, husk, shell, shuck.

GREEN OUTER COVER OF A WALNUT: hull, husk, shell, shuck.

40. LARGE, FLAT, YELLOWISH BEANS, NOT IN PODS: butter beans, lima beans, sewee beans, sivvy beans.

41. GREEN LEAFY COVER OF EAR OF CORN: cap, husk, shuck.

42. CORN EATEN ON COB: corn-on-the-cob, garden corn, green corn, mutton corn, roasting ears, sugar corn, sweet corn.

43. WORM USED FOR BAIT IN FISHING: angledog, angleworm, bait worm, eaceworm, earthworm, eelworm, fish bait, fishing worm, fishworm, mudworm, rainworm, redworm.

44. INSECT THAT GLOWS AT NIGHT: fire bug, firefly, glow worm, june bug, lightning bug.

45. LARGE WINGED INSECT SEEN AROUND WATER: darning needle, devil's darning needle, dragon fly, ear-sewer, mosquito hawk, sewing needle, snake doctor, snake feeder.

46. FRESHWATER SHELLFISH WITH CLAWS, SWIMS BACKWARD: crabs, craws, crawdad(die)s, crawfish, crayfish.

47. PLACE WHERE SAP IS GATHERED: maple grove, maple orchard, sap bush, sap orchard, sugar bush, sugar camp, sugar grove, sugar lot, sugar-maple grove, sugar orchard, sugar place, sugar-tree grove.

48. FAMILY WORD FOR FATHER: dad, daddy, father, pa, papa. pappy, paw, pop.

49. SICK ____ ____ ____: at his stomach, in his stomach, on his stomach, to his stomach, of his stomach.

50. TO COAST LYING DOWN FLAT: belly-booster, belly-bump, belly-bumper, belly-bunker, belly-bunt, belly-bust, belly-buster, belly-down, belly-flop, belly-flopper, belly-grinder, belly-gut, belly-gutter, belly-kachug, belly-kachunk, belly-whack, belly-wop, belly-whopper.

TO HIT THE WATER FLAT WHEN DIVING: belly-flop, belly-flopper, belly-bust, belly-buster.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED
MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Raven I. McDavid, Jr.
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER
AGREEMENTS WITH THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION.
FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM
REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

A CHECKLIST OF SIGNIFICANT FEATURES FOR DISCRIMINATING SOCIAL DIALECTS

Raven I. McDavid, Jr.

As an aid to the teacher who is interested in a more efficient approach to the problem of teaching a standard variety of English--for public roles--to those who use nonstandard varieties at home, the following list of features (all of which are both systematic and significant) has been drawn up, partly from the collections of the regional linguistic atlases, partly from more intensive local studies.

The emphasis is on those features of the language that recur frequently and are therefore most amenable to pattern drills. It must not be inferred that other, less well-patterned features of English are unimportant as social markers, but only that they do not lend themselves so readily to productive drill. Discriminating the principal parts of irregular verbs, such as past tense *saw* and past participle *seen*, is a part of the linguistic behavior that constitutes standard English, but the pattern *see/saw/seen* is duplicated only by such compounds of *see* as *foresee*. On the other hand, the discrimination between *I see* and *he sees* is a part of a pattern of subject-verb concord that is faced every time a subject is used with the present tense of a verb.

The list is concerned with social dialects of English and does not include all the problems faced by the native speaker of some other language. For each situation of this last kind one needs special contrastive studies like those being currently published by the University of Chicago Press. Native speakers of Czech or Finnish need to learn the accentual patterns of English; native speakers of continental European languages need to master the perfect phrase in such expressions of time as *I have been in Chicago for five years*; native speakers of almost every other language need to learn a finer-meshed set of vowel distinctions as between *peach* and *pitch*, *bait* and *bet* and *bat*, *pool* and *pull*, *boat* and *bought*, *hot* and *hut*.

The origins of these features are of indirect concern here; that they are of social significance is what concerns us. In general, however, it is clear that most of them may be traced back to the folk speech of England, and that in the United States none of them is exclusively identified with any racial group, though in any given community some of them may be relatively more frequent among whites or among Negroes.

This list is restricted to features that occur in speech as well as in writing. It is recognized that regional varieties of English differ in the distance between the norms of standard informal speech and standard formal writing. They vary considerably in the kinds of reductions of final consonant clusters, either absolutely or when followed by a word beginning with a consonant. The plural of sixth may be /sIks/, homonymous with the cardinal numeral; *bûrned a hóle* may be /bêrndə hól/ but *bûrned my pánts* /bêrn mai pánts/. Similarly the copula may not appear in questions such as *They ready?* *That your boy?* *We going now?* *She been drinking?* The auxiliary *have* may not even appear as a reflex of /v/ in such statements as *I been thinking about it* or *we been telling you this*. In families where the conventions of written and printed English are learned early as a separate subsystem, differences of this kind cause little trouble; but for speakers of non-standard dialects who have little home exposure to books, these features may provide additional problems in learning to write. It is often difficult for the teacher to overcome these problems in the students' writing without fostering an unnatural pronunciation.

It should be recognized, of course, that cultural situations may change in any community. To take the Southern dialectal situation with which I am most familiar, forty years ago there was a widespread social distinction in the allophones of /ai/. (1) The monophthongal [a.] was used by all classes finally, as in *rye*, or before voiced consonants as in *ride*; before voiceless consonants, however, educated speakers had a diphthong and many uneducated speakers used the monophthong, so that *nice white rice* became a well-known social shibboleth. In recent years, however, the shibboleth has ceased to operate, and many educated Southerners now have the monophthong in all positions; and the numbers of such speakers are increasing. This observation has also been made by James B. McMillan, of the University of Alabama, who added that in his experience the falling together of /ai/ and /a/, so that *fire* and *far*, *hired* and *hard*, become homonymous, was still restricted to non-standard speech. Yet very recently I noticed that this homonym was common on the Dallas radio, in the speech of the women's editor. (2)

It should not be assumed, furthermore, that one will find no other systematic features, discriminating standard speech from nonstandard in particular localities. Nor should we be so naive as to expect the speakers of any community to cease regarding the speech of outsiders as *ipso facto* inferior because it is different--even though these outsiders may be superior in education and social standing.

We are all ethnocentric after our own fashion; in our localities we may consider some differences important whether they are or not; and if enough people worry about them, some of these may actually become important. This is the traditional origin of neuroses, as well as the specific origin of the proscription of such useful features of English as *ain't* and the multiple negative. Meanwhile, it is probably good sense as well as good humor to recognize that though the white middle-class Chicagoan often considers the loss of /r/ in *barn* and the like a lower-class feature, the cultivated Southerner often associates the Middle Western /r/ in such words with the speech of poor whites--and that the distinction between /hw-/ and /w-/, as in *whales* and *wails* respectively, is socially diagnostic nowhere in the English-speaking world. The features listed here are diagnostic everywhere, though not all of them occur in every community where differences in social dialects are important.

Pronunciation:

1. The distinction between /θ/ as in *thin* and /t/ in *tin*, /f/ in *fin*, /s/ in *sin*.

2. The similar distinction between /ð/ in *them* and /d/, /v/, /z/.

3. The distinction between the vowels of *bird* and *Boyd*, *curl* and *coil*.

A generation ago this contrast was most significant among older speakers of the New York metropolitan area; uneducated older speakers regularly lacked it. It has become less important, since few of the younger speakers lack this distinction. But it should still be noted, not only for New York City but for New Orleans as well.

4. The omission, in substandard speech, of a weak-stressed syllable preceding the primary stress, so that *professor* may become *fessor*, *reporter* may become *porter*, and *insurance* become *shoo-ance* or *sho-ance*.

5. In substandard speech, a statistically disproportionate front-shifting of the primary stress, giving such forms as *po*-lice, *in*-surance, *ee*-ficiency, *gui*-tar, etc.

Front-shifting is characteristic of English borrowings from other languages; in *bal*cony it is completely accepted; in *ho*tel and *Ju*ly acceptability is conditioned by position in the sentence.

6. In substandard speech, heavy stress on what in standard English is a weak-stressed final syllable, giving acci*dent*, ele*ment*, presi*dent*, evi*dence*, etc.

Inflection:

NOUN

7. Lack of the noun plural: Two boy came (come) to see me.

8. Lack of the noun genitive: This (is) Mr. Brown hat.

PRONOUN

9. Analogizing of the /-n/ of mine to other absolute genitives, yielding ourn, yourn, hisn, hern, theirn.

10. Analogizing of the compound reflexives, yielding hisself, theirself, theirselves.

DEMONSTRATIVE

11. Substitution of them for those, as them books.

12. Compound demonstratives: these-here dogs, that-(th)ere house, them-(th)ere cats.

ADJECTIVES

13. Analogizing of inflected comparisons: the wonderfullest time, a lovinger child.

14. Double comparisons: a more prettier dress, the most ugliest man.

VERB

15. Unorthodox person-number concord of the present of to be. This may be manifest in generalizing of am or is or are, or in the use of be with all persons, singular and plural.

16. Unorthodox person-number concord of the past of be: I were, he were; we was, they was.

17. Failure to maintain person-number concord of the present indicative of other verbs: I does, he do (This is perhaps the most widely recognized diagnostic feature.)

Note that three third-person singular forms of common verbs are irregular, has, does /d^z/, says /sɛz/. In the last two the spelling conceals the irregularity, but many speakers who are learning this inflection will produce /duz/ and /sez/. The form bees is also derived from this kind of analogy.

18. Omission of the /-iŋ/ of the present participle: He was open a can of beer. (3)

19. Omission of /-t, -d, -ed/ of the past tense: I burn a hole in my pants yesterday.

Note that before a word beginning with a consonant the /-d/ may be omitted in speech in I burned my pants. Those who normally have this contextual loss of the sound may need to learn the special conventions of writing.

Note also that the loss of the inflection extends to those verbs that form the past tense and past participle irregularly.

20. Omission of /-t, -d, -əd/ of the past participle.

21. Omission of the verb to be in statements before a predicate nominative: He a good boy.

22. Omission of to be in statements before adjectives: They ready.

23. Omission of to be in statements before present participles: I going with you.

24. Omission of to be in statements before past participles: The window broke (n).

Note that in questions related to features 21-24 the verb to be may be omitted in standard oral English, though it would never be omitted in formal expository prose.

25. Omission of the /-s, -z, -əz/ reflex of has before been in statements: He been drinking.

Note that this omission may occur in questions in standard oral English, and also that in standard oral English many educated speakers may omit the /-v/ reflex of have: I been thinking about it; we been telling you this. Needless to say, this omission would not occur in standard expository prose.

26. Substitution of been, done, or done been for have, especially with a third singular subject: He done been finished. In other person-number situations done, at least, often occurs in standard oral English, as I done told you that three times.

NOTES

1. This observation was made, _inter alia_, in my analyses of the pronunciation of English in the Greenville, South Carolina, metropolitan area, presented to the Linguistic Society of America at its meetings in New York City (December, 1938) and Chapel Hill, North Carolina (July, 1941).

2. The monphthongal Southern /ai/ disturbs many Easterners and Middle Westerners. Some Philadelphians, for instance, allege that Southerners confuse _ride_ and _rod_; some Detroiters, that they confuse _right_ and _rat_. They do not; the confusion exists in _the_ minds of the Eastern and Middle Western observers.

3. The distinction between /-iŋ/ and /-in/ has no social significance. Both forms may be heard in educated speech, depending on the region from which the speaker comes and the style of discourse he is using.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

William M. Austin, Lawrence M.
Davis, N. Louanna Furbee, Emmett
Lally, Emily Pettigrew Norris,
Joseph Roy, Dagna Simpson

The following bibliography is organized under the following major categories:

- American English Dialects
- Animal Behavior and "Language"
- Bibliographies
- Computational Linguistics
- Educating the Disadvantaged
- English Linguistics (General)
- General Linguistics
- Glossaries
- Linguistics and the Teaching of English
- Paralanguage and Non-Verbal Communication
- Psycholinguistics and Sociolinguistics
- Research in Progress
- Selected Articles from *Language Learning*
- Teaching English as a Foreign Language
- Using the Language Laboratory

Any such division of subject matter must perforce be quite an arbitrary one. *The First Five Minutes*, for example, is listed under "Psycholinguistics and Sociolinguistics," but it could just as well have been listed under "Paralanguage and Non-verbal Communication." Since there are numerous such cases, one would do well to look under several heads.

Furthermore, the bibliography is in no sense exhaustive. Rather, it provides a full and representative selection of the research in the above fields; but the inclusion of some items and the omission of others in no way implies a value judgment on the part of the compilers.

American English Dialects

ATWOOD, E. Bagby. "Grease and Greasy: A Study of Geographical Variation," Studies in English. University of Texas (1950), 249-260.

The establishment of the greasy and greazy isogloss (dialect boundary) which runs through the eastern U. S. along U. S. highway 40. Southern speakers pronounce this word with a (z), and Northern speakers do so with an (s).

ATWOOD, E. Bagby. "The Methods of American Dialectology," Zeitschrift für Mundartforschung, XXX, No. 1 (1963), 1-29.

In this article (written in English) Atwood reviews American lexicography, pointing out that, although "dialect" words have been included in American general dictionaries, no dialect dictionary has ever been compiled. He then outlines in detail the history and methods of American dialectology, giving a comprehensive report on the Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada, its workers, its contributions, and its progress toward completion. The historical influences of European methods on the American dialect project are clearly set forth. This is perhaps the most succinct single statement on the Linguistic Atlas and its methods available.

ATWOOD, E. Bagby. A Survey of Verb Forms in the Eastern United States. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1953.

Drawn from the field records of the Linguistic Atlas of the U. S. and Canada, this is an excellent grammatical study of the regional dialects of the Eastern United States. Included are 56 tense forms, 10 personal forms of the present indicative, 8 items on number and concord, 8 negative forms, and 3 phrases. The distributions of these are discussed and mapped. One section in the book is devoted to social distribution of the forms.

COHEN, Paul S.; William Labov; Clarence Robins. A Preliminary Study of the Structure of English Used by Negro and Puerto Rican Speakers in New York City--An Outline of Research Results. Project Literacy Reports, (Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.), No. 7 (September, 1966), pp. 13-17.

The purpose of this investigation is to formulate an accurate linguistic picture of the English of Negro and Puerto Rican inhabitants of New York City, to determine the structural and functional conflicts between these forms of English and the standard English of white New Yorkers--conflicts which prevent such a large number of Negro and Puerto Rican youth from learning how to read. (Only the investigation among the Negroes has been completed.) The investigators found three sources of structural conflict (conflict in which the underlying linguistic structure is significantly different):

1. The loss of preconsonantal and word final r.
2. The loss or replacement by (ə) or (ð) of preconsonantal l.
3. The simplification of final consonant clusters, particularly those which comprise one or more instances of /s, z, t, d/.

The findings concerning the functional conflict (these stem from oppositions of value systems symbolized by specific linguistic variables) are less clear cut. What is apparent is that the conflict between the value systems represented by the nonstandard and standard dialects is a very real one, though in many cases it is below the level of conscious attention. The early data indicate a strong difference between the relative prestige of various speech forms as judged by white and Negro listeners. More data and analysis, however, are necessary before any precise pronouncements can be made in this area.

EVERTTS, Eldonna L. (ed.). Dimensions of Dialect. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1967.

This is a group of papers, many published in Elementary English, on education of pupils with dialect problems. Some articles are pertinent only to elementary school teaching, but many are applicable to other levels as well. Among the papers are "A Checklist of Significant Features for Discriminating Social Dialects" (Raven I. McDavid, Jr.), "Program for Teacher Language Improvement" (Charles B. Watts and Joseph Caliguri), "Dialect Barriers to Reading to Disadvantaged Negro Children" (Allison Davis), and "Teaching English to Indian Children" (Hildegard Thompson). There is an annotated bibliography for the elementary school level containing English and foreign language editions.

KURATH, Hans. Handbook of the Linguistic Geography of New England. Providence, Rhode Island: Brown University, 1939.

An explanation of the methods and findings of the Linguistic Atlas of New England and a guide to the Atlas itself. The dialect areas of New England are discussed in detail. The chapter on the settlement history of the region provides helpful insights into the development of the regional dialects of New England. Also included is information about every community and informant in the survey. The methods, including those for the training of fieldworkers, transcription field methods, and editorial procedures are outlined. A valuable addition is the comparison of the phonetic practices of the fieldworkers. One section presents the questionnaire itself and introductory comment on it. A number of maps are included.

KURATH, Hans; Raven I. McDavid, Jr. The Pronunciation of English in the Atlantic States. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1961.

Based upon the fieldwork of the Linguistic Atlases of New England and of the Middle and South Atlantic States, this is one of the first analyses of American pronunciation for which there is a significant corpus of data. The authors present a unitary interpretation of the vowel phoneme as being most useful for combining phonic data in an orderly way. There are 180 maps and discussions of cultivated and non-cultivated regional speech.

KURATH, Hans. A Word Geography of the Eastern United States. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1949.

The regional vocabularies of the Eastern United States are correlated with settlement histories to establish defined speech areas: North, Midland, and South, based on the materials of the Linguistic Atlas of the United States. In the third chapter, various regional and local words having the same meaning are discussed together. There are 163 maps showing the distribution of significant words and a glossary of these words. An enjoyable book to read and a standard reference in this field.

LABOV, William. The Social Stratification of English in New York City. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966.

By studying linguistic behavior in its social context, Labov has shown that the apparently inconsistent structure of New York City English is explicable in terms of certain social and stylistic norms. Certain speech variables are treated as continuous phonological variables rather than fluctuating constants. These are codified, defined, and measured on a quantitative linear scale.

LOMAN, Bengt. Conversations in a Negro American Dialect. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1967.

This book, the first of the "Urban Language Series," contains fourteen conversations with children transcribed in a modified standard orthography. The test, which includes some phonetic transcription, serves mainly as a basis for a prosodic analysis.

MAURER, David W. The Big Con, (ed. 3), New York, 1963.

A discussion of the argot of the big-time confidence man, with some attention to the ways criminal argot reflects a rigid class structure within the criminal world.

McDAVID, Raven I., Jr. "The Dialectology of an Urban Society"in Communications et Rapports du Premier Congress Internationale de Dialectology Generale, 1960: Premiere Partie. Louvain, France: A. J. Van Windekens, 1964, pp. 68-80.

The United States Linguistic Atlas survey is a first stage in dialect investigation. Second-stage studies, only recently undertaken, involve examination of selected areas in detail and, in particular,investigation of dialects at all social levels in any given geographical area.

McDAVID, Raven I., Jr. "Dialect Differences and Inter-Group Tensions," Studies in Linguistics, IX (1951), 27-33.

Demonstration of the usefulness of dialect study in the diagnosis of potential inter-group cleavages in American communities. Testing of the hypothesis that the appearance of new dialect differences between speakers of the same age and educational background in a community reflects the development of inter-group tensions.

McDAVID, Raven I., Jr. "Dialect Geography and Social Science Problems," Social Forces, XXV: 168-172, 1946-47.

Illustrations of the social factors underlying dialect differences, and the consequent need for linguistic information in the analysis of problems involving the social sciences.

McDAVID, Raven I., Jr. "The Talk of the Middle West," Inland: The Magazine of the Middle West. (Autumn, 1966), 12-17.

A lighthearted article, with a wealth of information on the speech of the Middle West. The author speaks not only of the linguistic characteristics of middle western dialects, but also of the influences on the area that helped to bring about these characteristics. Two main groups of poor people settled the area--Southerners and people from New England, with the former settling in the southern part of the Midwest, and the latter settling along the Great Lakes. Borrowings from Indian languages (tomahawk, wigwam), French (Detroit, Shivaree), and German (strudel, scram), among others, are discussed. McDavid also points to the pronunciation differences within the Chicago area regarding the pronunciation of the name of the city itself (Chicagoans say Chicawgo, while suburbanites say ah for the stressed vowel). Finally, McDavid points to Negro dialects in the Midwest, with the use of non-standard grammatical forms like we says, they be, and it do.

McDAVID, Raven I., Jr. "Sense and Nonsense About American Dialects," PMLA, LXXXI, No. 2, 1966, 7-17.

This article refutes many of the nonsense ideas that people have about standard and non-standard speech, such as the belief in a "mystical standard devoid of all regional association," and the belief in "racial dialects." McDavid also discusses social dialects, and makes some recommendations to the schools.

McDAVID, Raven I., Jr. and William M. Austin (eds.). Communication Barriers to the Culturally Deprived. (Cooperative Research Project 2107), Washington, D. C.: USOE HEW, 1966.

People identify the social backgrounds of others by the way they speak. The investigators designed new research techniques and modified others to prove this, and their report stands as an excellent guide for others contemplating similar studies. During 1963 and 1964, field interviews were conducted with representatives of middle and lower class speech of both whites and Negroes. These data were analyzed phonologically, grammatically, paralinguistically, and lexically. A test was then prepared and administered to a large sample of persons of various educational backgrounds to learn what cultural judgments might be made on the basis of dialect. Following are some of the conclusions of the study:

1. Vocabulary reflects cultural experience and changes as people become urbanized.
2. Grammar reflects social and educational advantages.
3. Pronunciation differences between middle class and lower class white speech or between middle class and lower class Negro speech are less easy to detect than differences between the speech of white Chicagoans and Southern Negroes. To eliminate this social handicap of Southern pronunciation would be desirable, so functional bi-dialectalism should be the goal. It would also be desirable to include in elementary and secondary English programs material on the nature of language, the origins of dialects, and the variety of cultivated pronunciations in the United States.
4. The investigators felt intuitively that suprasegmentals and paralanguage are more effective indicators of ethnic background than vocabulary, grammar, or pronunciation.

McDAVID, Raven I. Jr. and Virginia Glenn McDavid. "The Relationship of the Speech of American Negroes to the Speech of Whites," American Speech, XXVI: (1951), 3-17.

Use of evidence from the study of African languages and of creolized Negro speech (1) to refute the idea that the speech of the American Negro is somehow related to his physical characteristics, and (2) to show that some speech forms of Negroes and some whites are derived from an African cultural background by the normal processes of cultural transmission.

PEDERSON, Lee A. "The Pronunciation of English in Metropolitan Chicago," Publication of the American Dialect Society, XLIV (1965).

This study attempts to relate the speech of rural and suburban areas of Chicago to the dialect of the central city. The complex problems of urban centralization, mass education, and social mobility are approached with preliminary procedures designed to interpret their influence on the speech of the informants.

PEDERSON, Lee A. and William A. Stewart (eds.). "Non-Standard Negro Speech in Chicago," Non-Standard Speech and the Teaching of English. Language Information Series--2, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1964.

This paper is essentially a summary of social dialect research in Chicago, which includes as one of its sources, material collected for the Cognitive Environment Study. Although this study is limited neither to Negroes nor to linguistic problems, the phonology of Negro speech has been a part of the first phase of the investigation, and some tentative findings concerning pronunciation are summarized here. Interesting comparisons are made of Negro and white speech in Chicago. This study notes the differences between Negro and white speech, and also notes the broad distinction between the speech of the native-born Chicago Negroes and that of Southern or Midland-born immigrant Negroes. The article points out certain phonemic differences between the urban speech of white natives of Chicago (especially of lower classes) as distinct from that of the surrounding region. It also points out the distinctive features of pronunciation observed when one compares samples of urban Negro speech with either urban or metropolitan speech. Pederson concludes by saying that it is evident that the average Chicago Negro, native or immigrant, speaks a variety of English different in many ways from that of the rest of the population, and that these differences may create a real barrier to the acquisition of a fluent command of the standard English so necessary for social advancement in the world of the white majority.

SHUY, Roger W. *Discovering American Dialects*. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1967.

This publication is useful as an introduction to American dialects and dialect study. It defines "dialect" and explains how and why one dialect is set off from another by features of pronunciation, words, and grammatical forms. Discussed also is the present status of American dialects and dialectology. Some materials are presented in order that readers might discover, for themselves, the differences in dialects.

SLEDD, James H. "Breaking, Umlaut, and the Southern Drawl," *Language*, XLII (1966), 18-41.

Sledd takes issue with Trager and Smith's and Kurath's representation of the phonology of English and shows how phontactic rules can account for much of the complexity of Southern speech.

SLEDD, James and Wilma R. Ebbit. *Dictionaries and That Dictionary: A Casebook on the Aims of Lexicographers and the Targets of Reviewers*, Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1962.

That dictionary is, of course, *Webster's Third New International*. This is both a text in lexicography and a collection of the most well-known defenses of and attacks on *Webster's Third*. It is readable and interesting.

STEWART, William. "Observations on the Problems of Defining Negro Dialect," Washington, D. C.: CAL and NCTE, April, 1966.

This article discusses the social connotations of the word "Negro" in the United States and elsewhere. The article also points out that, perhaps, Negro dialects may be a kind of Creole, and, as such, may have a deep structure different from that of white speech. Stewart then suggests that theories of teaching English to disadvantaged Negroes, if the Creole hypothesis is correct, should be modified in that direction.

STEWART, William A. "Sociolinguistic Factors in the History of American Negro Dialects," *The Florida Fl Reporter*, V, No. 2, (Spring, 1967) 1-4.

As the title implies this article deals mainly with history of American Negro dialects. There is, however, an introduction which highlights the main problems of the speakers of a substandard dialect and recounts some of the ways in which this problem has been alleviated. Stewart states that the dialect-based problems can render a non-standard speaker dysfunctional in exchanges with standard-English-speaking members of the middle class. One way for this situation to occur is for minor pronunciation differences between a non-standard and a standard dialect to pile up in an utterance to such an extent that the non-standard version becomes unintelligible to a middle class listener. As an example, he gives the non-standard sentence "Dey ain't like dat." which to the non-standard speaker means "They didn't like that.", and to the standard speaker "They aren't like that." Even though this speaker may, in some cases, make himself understood, he is still considered uncouth for saying it the way he does.

TURNER, Lorenzo D. *Africanisms in the Gullah Dialect*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Basically, this book is a repudiation of the idea that the variety of creole Gullah spoken by the inhabitants of the island off the coasts of South Carolina and Georgia is a survival of the "...baby-talk which the white people, during the early period of slavery, found necessary to use in communication with the slaves." It supports the idea that the pronunciation, lexicon, syntax, and morphological features of this variety of speech are based on an African substratum rather than the characteristics of British dialects of the seventeenth century.

WILSON, Kenneth G., R. H. Hendrickson, and Peter Alan Taylor (eds.). *Harbrace Guide to Dictionaries*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1963.

A survey of lexicography, in four parts, with selected readings on each topic. In the section "What is a Dictionary?" there are articles on the history of lexicography, a group of prefaces and forewords from various dictionaries (Johnson to present-day), and opinions on linguistics and use of language (James Sledd, Jacques Barzun, and Paul Roberts). In Part Two, "What Kinds of Dictionaries Are There?", the editors discuss desk, unabridged, encyclopedic, historical, special-vocabulary, synonyms, and usage dictionaries. Entries, orthography, pronunciation, parts of speech, etymology, definitions, usage labels, synonymy, and encyclopedic information are covered in a third section which features articles by Albert H. Marckwardt, R. H. Hendrickson, Mitford M. Mathews, Charles C. Fries, John S. Kenyon, and Miles L. Hanley, among others. The last section presents Dwight MacDonald's attack on *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, and Bergen Evans' defense of the same.

REED, Carroll E. *Dialects of American English*. Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Co., 1967.

A good introduction, geared to a reader with little knowledge of American dialects. Also includes a survey of past and current dialect research and discussion of the future of American dialect studies.

Animal Behavior and "Language"

FRISCH, K. von. *Bees, Their Vision, Chemical Senses, and Language.* Utica, New York: Cornell University Press, 1950.

FRISCH, K. von. *The Dancing Bees*.

KROEBER, A. L. "Sign and Symbol in Bee Communications," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, XXXVIII (1952), 753-758.

FRINGS, H. and M. "The Language of Crows," *Scientific American*, CCI (1959), 119-131.

SCOTT, John Paul. *Animal Behavior*, 1958, (The Natural History Library, N29).

THORPE, N. H. "The Language of Birds," *Scientific American*, CXCV (1956), 129-138.

Bibliographies

ALLEN, Harold B. Linguistics and English Linguistics. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.

An extensive bibliography arranged by the following major topics:

1. Linguistics--includes, among others, general linguistics, communication theory, generative grammar, phonetics, phonemics, psycholinguistics.
2. English Language and English Linguistics--history of English, English grammar, American English, British and American English, vocabulary.
3. Language Instruction--general studies, English to English speakers, English as a foreign language.
4. Special topics--includes, among others, bilingualism, cant, jargon, slang, paralanguage, dialect geography, stylistics.

Aural Aids in English for Foreigners. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1964, 11 pp. 25¢.

A non-selective list of materials on tape or LP records commercially produced in the U. S. or by American authors contains 43 entries from single records to complete courses of 160 tapes of which 11 are identified as designed for Spanish speakers. Unclassified; annotated; includes publishers' addresses.

BOOTH, Robert E.; Theodore Manheim; Diane A. Satterthwaite; and Gloria L. Dardarian. Culturally Disadvantaged: A Bibliography and Keyword-Out-of-Context (KWOC) Index. Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University Press, 1967.

An extensive bibliography in three parts: one arranged by author, one by title, and one by Keyword-Out-of-Context (a subject cross-reference index).

Educational Research Information Center (ERIC), USOE HEW.

Research in Education. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

A catalog of current research in education, including report resumes, report indexes, project resumes, and project indexes. Published monthly.

FERGUSON, Charles A. and William A. Stewart. Linguistic Reading Lists for Teachers of Modern Languages. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1963, 114 pp. $2.50.

Contains a General Reading List of 30 books and articles in linguistics and English (with annotations largely taken from Sirarpi Ohannessian, Interim Bibliography on the Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Washington: CAL, 1960), "which linguists would recommend for the professional library of any language teacher," followed by separate bibliographies for French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish, each compiled and introduced by a different linguist or pair of linguists. Materials in the bibliography for Spanish, by William A. Stewart, "have been chosen for their usefulness either as pedagogical tools or as sources for the kind of knowledge about the linguistic form and behavior of Spanish which a teacher of the language should either know or have access to." Restricted to "more important works dealing with modern standard Spanish," excluding "specialized studies on archaic, regional, or substandard varieties." Includes recommendations for keeping apprised of new publications on Spanish, a "fairly complete list of the other bibliographies which have been compiled," 115 items, 85 annotations, with abbreviations indicating the primary field(s) or utility of an item, e.g., contr. contrastive study; 21 items are labeled as partly or wholly contrastive.

GORDON, Edmund W. IRCD Bulletin. ERIC Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged, Ferkauf Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences, 55 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 10003.

A bi-monthly publication devoted to research projects, programs, theory, and publication concerning the education of the culturally disadvantaged. Usually contains extensive bibliographies.

HAMMER, John H. and Frank A. Rice. A Bibliography of Contrastive Linguistics. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1965, 41 pages, $1.50.

A revised and expanded version of William W. Gage's Contrastive Studies in Linguistics: A Bibliographical Checklist (Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1961), published in connection with a project of contrastive structure series carried out by CAL under a contract with USOE. For the purposes of this bibliography, a contrastive structure study means "a systematic comparison of selected linguistic features of two or more languages, the intent of which is...to provide teachers and textbook writers with a body of information which can be of service in the preparation of instructional materials, the planning of courses, and the development of classroom techniques." Excludes those "linguistically oriented in which the constrastive element is of secondary importance, e.g., textbooks, reference grammars, etc." and "constrastive studies of two or more dialects of a single language." Includes (1) a general section, followed by (2) an alphabetical arrangement of entries according to foreign language excluding a heading for English since it is included in over half the contrastive studies listed, (3) an alphabetical author index, and (4) an addenda of titles noted while the bibliography was in press.

HAUGEN, Einar. Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide, Publications of the American Dialect Society, XXVI (1956).

A comprehensive bibliography on bilingualism preceded by a text that is a substantial introduction to the problem. Sections are (1) the scope of the problem, (2) languages of the Americas, (3) language contact, (4) the bilingual individual, (5) the bilingual community, and (6) approaches to research.

OHANNESSIAN, Sirarpi. Interim Bibliography on the Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1960, 53 pages, 75¢.

A fully annotated, selective list of materials that have appeared since Robert Lado's Annotated Bibliography for Teachers of English as a Foreign Language, (Washington: U. S. Govt. Printing Office, 1955, 244 pp.), with the exception of a few works included as classics, members of a series, or relevant to areas in which little work has been done. "The general principle in making the selections was to render the present list as useful as possible to teachers and to administrators, within the limitations of time and size." Excludes dictionaries, tests, periodical articles, and audio-visual materials as such. 143 entries classified as follows: I. Background Readings. a. Linguistics, Language, and Language Problems. b. English Language c. Periodicals. d. Bibliographies. II. Methodology. a. FL Teaching. b. Teaching English as a Foreign Language. c. Language Testing and Audio-Visual Aids. III. Textbooks. a. For Schools. b. For Adults. c. For Special Backgrounds for Occupations. d. Readers. A list of publishers' addresses is appended.

OHANNESSIAN, Sirarpi, et al. Reference List of Materials for English as a Second Language. Part I: Texts, Readers, Dictionaries, and Tests. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1964.

Part I of a two-part comprehensive annotated bibliography of resources for the teaching of English as a foreign language published between 1953 and 1963. Approximately 800 entries, divided into six sections:

1. General Text Material for multilingual situations or for the general student of English (175 entries).
2. Text Material for Specific Language Backgrounds arranged alphabetically according to language from African Languages to Vietnamese: includes readers as well as texts and some materials that reflect 1) earlier approaches and 2) non-western values (475 entries).
3. Text Material for Specialized Fields for students of science and technology, medicine, engineering, etc. (53 entries).
4. American Readers (31 entries).
5. Dictionaries limited to 20 from the good ones available.
6. Tests and examinations (27 entries).

Annotations include information about level of instruction, age group for which texts are intended, areas of grammar, pronunciation, and accompanying audio-visual aids. An alphabetical author index is appended.

OHANNESSIAN, Sirarpi, et al. Reference List of Materials for English as a Second Language. Part II: Background Materials and Methodology. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966, 105 pp.

Approximately 700 annotated entries in seven sections, subdivided as follows:

1. Background (158 entries). Linguistics, English Language, Bibliographies, Periodicals.
2. Methodology (334 entries). Language Teaching, Teaching English, Teaching Aids.
3. Preparation and Analysis of Materials (23 entries).
4. Preparation of Teachers (28 entries).
5. Language Testing (21 entries). General, English.
6. Programs in Specific Geographical Areas (133 entries). General, Africa, The Americas, Europe, Far East, Middle East, Oceania, South Asia.

Includes an addenda of 34 unannotated entries of publications appearing after 1963 which "will be annotated and included in a supplement" now in preparation. Alphabetical author index.

OHANNESSIAN, Sirarpi. 30 Books for Teachers of English as a Foreign Language. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1963.

Intended for use by Americans going overseas to teach English as a foreign language, but of value to English teachers generally, this fully annotated bibliography is a revision of a list first prepared by CAL in 1959 and issued in revised form in 1962. Books on method were chosen to provide a variety of approach; textbooks were selected in terms of appropriateness to age level, level of achievement, and varying needs. Divided into three sections: (1) Background Readings, (2) Methodology, and (3) Textbooks, with an author-title index and a list of publishers' addresses.

Research in International Education. National Association for Foreign Student Affairs and the Institute for International Education.

Reports of current research in the teaching and testing of English as a second language (while the primary interest is in the foreign student and in international education).

RICE, Frank A. and Allene Guss. Information Sources in Linguistics: A Bibliographical Handbook. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 42 pages, $1.50.

Intended primarily for the student of linguistics at the upper undergraduate or graduate level, this handbook attempts to cover (1) "all the major traditional fields of linguistics," (2) "most of the major theoretical approaches to linguistic analysis," and (3) "the major fields of linguistics and related disciplines." Does not include analyses of particular languages, articles published outside the U. S. Divided into six sections: (1) Fields Within Linguistics, (2) Linguistics and Related Disciplines, (3) Applied Linguistics, (4) Abstracts, (5) Classification Systems, (6) Manpower (registries of specialists), with the first subdivision of the first three sections devoted to a general works classification that includes bibliographies, periodicals, monographs, congresses and proceedings, maps, atlases, handbooks, histories and surveys, theory and method. Contains some brief annotations and an author index.

WALTERS, Theodore W. , S. J. The Georgetown Bibliography of Studies Contributing to the Psycholinguistics of Language Learning. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press, 1965.

An extensive bibliography arranged alphabetically by author, and cross-indexed by topic. Topics include age and sex of learner, bilingualism, motivation, and 36 others.

Computational Linguistics

CHERRY, Colin. On Human Communications. New York: Science Editions, Inc., 1961.

A very interesting book for the more advanced student. Although other avenues are explored (e.g. acoustics and semantics), the main approach is through mathematical logic and information theory.

DOLEZEL, Lubomir; Peter Segall; and Josef Vachek (eds.). Prague Studies in Mathematical Linguistics: Volume 1: Statistical Linguistics, Algebraic Linguistics, and Machine Translation, University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1966.

A collection of articles that apply the methods of modern mathematics to problems of Czechoslavakian linguistics by a group of Prague School linguists. Articles are difficult and specialized; 19 are in English and 5 in Russian.

GARVIN, Paul L. and Bernard Spolsky (eds.). Computation in Linguistics: A Case Book. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1966.

Represents the research of the first course ever given in computational linguistics, conducted at the Summer Institute of Linguistics at the University of Indiana in 1964. The cases constitute valuable models for future work in this area.

GARVIN, Paul L. (ed.). Natural Language and the Computer. New York, N. Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963.

A valuable collection of articles that completely introduce the reader to this new field. The initial article, by Garvin, "A Definitional Model of Language," is essentially the American structuralist approach. The second article, by Stockwell, is a good short introduction to transformational grammar. The third article, by Sebeok, is an information theory approach to the problem which contains an extensive bibliography on non-verbal communication.

HAYS, David G. *Computational Linguistics*. New York: American Elsevier Publishing Co., 1967.

Designed as a text for beginning courses in computational linguistics, this book gives a solid introduction to a relatively new field. There are problems for practice and suggestions for application of the techniques, including possibilities for geographical dialect studies.

HAYS, David G. (ed.). *Readings in Automatic Language Processing*. New York: American Elsevier Publishing Co., 1966.

This collection of articles treats a considerable number of the applications of computer science to areas of linguistics such as lexicography, parsing, syntactic analysis, and translation.

Educating the Disadvantaged

BEREITER, Carl and Siegfried Englemann. *Methodology, Elementary School: Projects, Urban and Rural Teaching Disadvantaged Children in the Preschool*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

A program to provide the disadvantaged child with the background to begin first grade on equal footing with more privileged children is presented in a detailed discussion of proved teaching methods and curricula. The emphasis is on learning through direct verbal instruction. The book features a complete curriculum guide, a language program, a music program, and presentations of teaching methods.

CHEYNEY, Arnold B. *Teaching Culturally Disadvantaged in the Elementary School*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1967.

The purpose of this book is to help teachers of the culturally disadvantaged become aware of the strengths of such students so that they can use their students' strong points in presenting material to them. Culturally disadvantaged children are physically oriented, fantasy prone, good role players, inductive, problem oriented, spacially oriented, visual-artistic, expressive, perseverant, and verbally abstract. These strengths are discussed individually in the text. All programs (language development in general, reading, listening, speaking, and writing) are designed to take advantage of these abilities in culturally disadvantaged children. Included are extensive bibliographies and sample lesson plans.

COWLES, Millie (ed.). *Perspectives in the Education of Disadvantaged Children*. Cleveland, Ohio: World Publishing Co., 1967.

This is a collection of papers which explore some basic concepts in the social sciences and medicine as they relate to education. These articles were first used as background reading for the teachers who attended the 1965 Rutgers Head Start Orientation Program.

GORDON, Edmund W. and Doxey A. Wilkerson. *Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged, Programs and Practices: Preschool through College*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

An examination and critique of current compensatory education in relation to its effectiveness in teaching the disadvantaged. Programs at all levels (elementary, secondary, college) are considered. The text gives special attention to the social problems involved, the types of programs offered, school staffing and training, and home and community involvement. Guidelines are offered in all these areas. There is a list of compensatory education programs in the United States with descriptions of each and the address of administrator for each. Also included is a short bibliography.

HICKERSON, Nathaniel. Education for Alienation. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

The United States today wastes a vast amount of human energy, resources and talent, mostly of persons born into poverty, through inadequate school programs. The author views the schools as a mirror of a society that creates the conditions of waste. Just as economically deprived adults are alienated from society, so are their children alienated from the schools. The author suggests revisions in school attitudes and programs that could halt the waste of talent among the economically deprived, among which are:

1. Teach urban sociology to prospective Ghetto teachers.
2. Accept no bigot into the teaching profession.
3. Weed out bigots already teaching.
4. Teach race relations to children.
5. Eliminate IQ tests as means of determining innate intelligence in children.
6. Get parents of deprived children involved in the school.
7. Bring successful minority group representatives to the schools.
8. Strengthen school curricula in deprived areas.
9. Continue desegregation process.
10. Institute massive in-service programs for teachers, administrators, and counselors now in the public schools.

JANOWITZ, Gayle. Helping Hands: Volunteer Work in Education. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Helping Hands outlines one way of combating the failure of the traditional educational system to reach the children from disadvantaged environments. Mrs. Janowitz set up neighborhood out-of-school programs for such children, using volunteer teachers to provide children with the atmosphere, personal attention, and reassurance they need to relate to the world of traditional classrooms. Her study centers have been encouragingly successful and her book provides a handbook for others to follow.

JEWETT, Arno; Joseph Mersand; and Doris V. Gunderson (eds.). English Skills of Culturally Different Youth. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1964.

A group of excerpts from talks made at a conference on improving English Skills of Culturally Different Youth in large cities, May 31-June 2, 1962, sponsored by the Secondary Schools Section of the U. S. Office of Education. Papers are arranged in given sections: (1) a survey of the problems, (2) research, (3) improving language skills, (4) specific programs, and (5) teacher qualifications and training. Among the reports, these are especially useful: "Research and its Implications (Marjorie Smiley), "Language Ability in the Elementary School: Implications of Findings Pertaining to the Culturally Disadvantaged" (Walter Loban), "The Philadelphia Reading Program for Disadvantaged Youth" (Rosemary Green Wilson), and "Personal and Professional Qualifications for Teachers of Culturally Different Youth" (Alexander M. Moore). A short, but well abstracted bibliography has been prepared by Doris V. Gunderson.

National Conference on Education of the Disadvantaged. (Report of a National Conference Held in Washington, D. C., July 18-20, 1966), Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

This report includes a summary of the panel discussions, a section on special problems, and the texts of major addresses (those by the President and Vice-President of the United States and by the U. S. Commissioner of Education). Its focus is on the things wrong with education today.

"The Negro American," Daedelus XCIV, No. 4, (Fall, 1965).

A collection of essays on the history, sociology, political influence, and economics of the Negro American community. An outstanding group of contributors (John Hope Franklin, Phillip Hauser, Talcott Parsons, John B. Turner, and Whitney M. Young, Jr., among them) provide a penetrating look at the place of the Negro in American society.

PASAMANICK, B. and H. Knobloch. "Early Language Behavior in Negro Children and the Testing of Intelligence," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, L, (1955) 401-402.

Forty Negro children at two years of age were found to have lowered language scores. This was apparently due to lack of verbal responsiveness rather than poor language comprehension. One interesting finding was that there was an apparent earlier awareness of racial differences by Negro children than by whites, which is related to the former's lack of verbal responsiveness. This does have, for the educator, very serious implications in the field of ethnic group psychology, particularly in the use of verbal items on intelligence tests. An understanding of the inter-relatedness of verbal responsiveness and intelligence testing will give the reader an idea of why our schools have inadequately met the challenge of measuring the learning capacities of our underprivileged minorities.

SHUY, Roger W. (ed.). Social Dialects and Language Learning. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964.

A report of the 1964 social dialects conference held in Bloomington, Indiana. It contains seven sections: "Social Dialectology," "Reports on Field Projects," "Reports on School and College Teaching Programs," "Social Factors in Learning Standard English," "Reactions of Related Behavior Sciences," "Implications for Future Research," and a "Summary" which is a review of the important points discussed and an evaluation of their implications.

STEWART, William A. "Foreign Language Teaching Method in a Quasi-Foreign Language Situation," Non-Standard Speech and the Teaching of English. Language Information Series-2, Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1964.

This paper concentrates on the extensions and modifications of the differences inherent in the two kinds of language teaching. Stewart says that there are two types of language teaching situations: The teaching of the "first" or "native" language and the teaching of a "foreign" or "second" language. The fact that the new language learner has already internalized the basic behavioral patterns of another language--patterns which differ from those to be learned--means that the language teaching techniques should take special account of the ways in which the differences between the native and the new languages are liable to produce interference problems for the learner. He then shows several languages which are similar to English but have their own systems. The examples given are Jamaican Creole and Liberian Pidgin English. These languages exemplify situations in which the languages are so systematized and so different from the language upon which they may be based that they warrant the use of different textbooks and methods.

STEWART, William A. (ed.). *Non-Standard Speech and the Teaching of English*. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1964.

Three papers on teaching standard dialect to speakers of non-standard dialects; all recommend teaching by foreign language methods. The first two articles are by linguists, and the third is by an English teacher. The articles are "Foreign Language Teaching Methods in Quasi-Foreign Language Situations," by William A. Stewart; "Non-Standard Negro Speech in Chicago," by Lee A. Pederson; "Some Approaches to Teaching English as a Second Language," by Charlotte K. Brooks.

WEBSTER, Staten W. (ed.). *The Disadvantaged Learner: Knowing, Understanding, Educating*. San Francisco, California: Chandler Publishing Company, 1966.

These are readings from a wide variety of sources and arranged in three sections: knowing, understanding, and educating. Represented are articles on many types of disadvantaged American Indians, Appalachians, Negroes, both urban and rural, and Spanish-Americans among others. Taken as a whole, this collection offers insight on the sociological, anthropological, and psychological aspects of being disadvantaged and surveys the problems and promises of education for these groups.

English Linguistics (General)

ALLEN, Harold B. (ed.). *Readings in Applied English Linguistics*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964 (2nd ed.).

Essays on various aspects of applied English linguistics, ranging over several categories: historical background, English linguistics today, linguistic geography, linguistics and usage, linguistics and the teaching of grammar and composition, linguistics and the dictionary, and linguistics and the study of literature. There are eight articles on dialectology:

1. Hans Kurath, "Area Linguistics & the Teacher of English."
2. Albert H. Marckwardt, "Linguistic Geography & Freshman English."
3. Harold B. Allen, "The Linguistic Atlases: Our New Resource."
4. Albert H. Marckwardt, "Principal and Subsidiary Dialect Areas in the North Central States."
5. Harold B. Allen, "The Primary Dialect Areas of the Upper Midwest."
6. E. Bagby Atwood, "*Grease* and *Greasy*: A Study of Geographical Variation."
7. Raven I. McDavid, Jr., "Some Social Differences in Pronunciation."
8. Hans Kurath, "Phonemics and Phonics in Historical Phonology."

ALLEN, Robert Livingston. *The Verb System of Present-Day American English*. The Hague, The Netherlands: Mouton & Co., 1966.

The author postulates that all verbs are either time-oriented or non-time-oriented. The former are further categorized according to time(tenses), voice, aspect, time-relationship and anticipation, mood (e.g., *will/shall/can*), quasi-mood (e.g., *have to/have got to*), irreality (e.g., *he/she/it* + *were*), person, and status (e.g., *+ not/n't*). The latter are further categorized into voice, aspect, time-relationship and anticipation, quasi-mood (e.g., *be going to*), and status(e.g., + *not/n't*).

BAUGH, Albert C. *A History of the English Language*. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1935; 2nd ed. 1958.

A standard text in the history of the English language, scholarly throughout. The book traces the language from Old English through Middle and Early Modern English to Modern English.

FRANCIS, W. Nelson. *The English Language, An Introduction: Background for Writing*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1963.

An elementary text for use in undergraduate English language courses and in freshmen composition classes.

FRANCIS, W. Nelson; Raven I. McDavid, Jr. *The Structure of American English*. New York: Ronald Press, 1958.

An introductory text, based on Trager and Smith's *Outline of English Structure* and Fries' *American English Grammar* and *The Structure of English*. There are chapters on phonetics, phonemics, morphology, syntax, and American dialects. The last, contributed by McDavid, summarizes the methodology employed by the Linguistic Atlas, and also gives a picture of the major dialect areas of the Eastern U. S.

FRIEND, Joseph H. *An Introduction to English Linguistics*. Cleveland: The World Publishing Co., 1967.

An easy-to-read, short introduction to English linguistics. There is a chapter on dialects, particularly American regional dialects, with some comparison to British dialects, and a discussion of nonstandard and standard English. The main body of the book is devoted to a brief treatment of Indo-European language family, with reference to English, history of English, and structure of English words. There is little on syntax and phonology, although stress and juncture are covered. A useful glossary and bibliography are included.

FRIES, Charles Carpenter. *American English Grammar: The Grammatical Structure of Present-Day American English with Special Reference to Social Differences or Class Dialects*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1940.

An examination of the English used in letters to the U. S. War Department during World War I. Fries divides the writers into three classes based upon education and status: Class I. college graduates of recognized social standing; Class II, one year of high school to one year of college, businessmen, shop foremen etc.; Class III, eighth grade education or less, and in unskilled occupations. He outlines the following form classes: nominals, verbs, modifiers and function words (e.g. prepositions, conjunctions, auxiliary verbs), then analyzes how the three groups differ in their use of English. Some of his conclusions are at variance with the dicta of "good English authorities" when he finds that "It's me," "I will," and other so-called "errors" are used by cultivated writers (Class I).

FRIES, Charles Carpenter. *The Structure of English: An Introduction to the Construction of English Sentences*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1952.

Fries uses data from recorded telephone conversations of well-educated speakers. Parts of speech classifications, introduced in his *American English Grammar*, are further refined. The exposition of immediate constituents is excellent.

HILL, Archibald A. *Introduction to Linguistic Sturctures*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1958 (pp. 13-30).

A thoroughgoing analysis of English stress, juncture, and intonation, with original examples. The limitations of the Trager-Smith analysis of the relationship of phonology to syntax are demonstrated. The book makes useful observations on the grammar of spoken English.

JOOS, Martin. *The English Verb: Form and Meanings*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1964.

A definitive study of the verb in Standard English by an outstanding American linguist. The exposition is clear; the analysis, rigorous. The data for British usage from Sybille Bedford's *The Trial of Dr. Adams*, which, through a written novel, "carefully mirrors actual English speech..." (H. L. Smith).

KRAPP, George P. *The English Language in America*, 2 vols. New York: The Century Co., 1925.

This two volume treatment of the history of English in America deals with both the spoken and the written language. It is the best treatment of the American language before Mencken and is still considered a classic.

KURATH, Hans. *A Phonology and Prosody of Modern English*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1964.

In this brief volume, the author presents a phonemic analysis of English, including phonotactics and morphophonemics, as well as the historical development of his system and a statement of graphemics. In a second edition, each phoneme is discussed individually, according to articulation, distribution, regionalisms, variants, homophones, history, and spelling. This is a valuable book.

LEES, Robert B. *The Grammar of English Nominalizations*. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1963.

This is a comprehensive treatment of one of the most important aspects of English grammar--how nouns are constructed from other parts of speech. The methodology is essentially transformational.

MARCKWARDT. Albert H. *American English*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958.

A history of the English language in America. This view of American English and its cultural setting provides a good introduction to the subject and gives valuable background for further dialect study.

MARCKWARDT, Albert H. *Introduction to the English Language.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1942.

An excellent introductory text. The material begins with Modern English and a phonology section, then leads backwards, through Early Modern English and Middle English, to Old English. The book has ample exercises integrated with the text so that one learns the principles and techniques of scholarship by practice with them. The reverse chronological method seems especially reasonable.

MENCKEN, H. L. *An Inquiry into the Development of the American Language: English in the United States*, (ed. by Raven I. McDavid, Jr.). New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.

An outstanding abridgement of the classic study of American English. Mencken brought together data on the origins and development of American English, and argued for the superiority of American English as opposed to English English. McDavid has added new material, and David W. Maurer contributed the chapter on criminal argot. The wit and prose style are still Mencken's or Mencken-like, and, as such, are commendable in their own right. The extensive bibliography is up-to-date as of the date of printing.

NIDA, Eugene A. *A Synopsis of English Syntax*. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1966.

An extensive synopsis of English constructions based on the immediate constituent method of analysis. It is well written, with numerous illustrations of the features noted.

NIST, John. *A Structural History of English*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1966.

A linguistics-based survey of the English language which, after a brief review of present-day English structure, covers the history of the language from Old English to Modern English in terms of phonology, morphology, and syntax. An annotated bibliography and study questions are at the end of each chapter. A glossary of linguistic terms is also included. The book is far more difficult than those by Baugh, Marckwardt, or Pyles.

PIKE, Kenneth L. *The Intonation of American English*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1945.

An extensive exposition of Pike's analysis of intonation in American English, inspired by the need for a system of teaching English intonation patterns to native Spanish speakers learning English as a second language. In addition to the very thorough treatment of intonation, including examples and methodological considerations, the bibliography is comprehensive up to the date of publication.

PYLES, Thomas. *The Origins and Development of the English Language*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965.

A good introductory book on the history of the English language. It is clear exposition, with a large section devoted to the modern period (since 1500), and it includes a selected bibliography. Pyles and John Algeo have written a workbook to supplement the text, called *Problems in the Origins and Development of the English Language*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1966.

PYLES, Thomas. *Words and Ways of American English*. New York: Random House, 1952.

A well-written history of American English, sound in scholarship and without a trace of pedantry. Pyles presents a comprehensive history of dictionary-making in the U. S., as well as a good analysis of the various sources of the American vocabulary. He presents no analysis of the linguistic structure of American English, however.

ROBERTSON, Stuart (Revised by Frederic G. Cassidy). *The Development of Modern English*, 2nd ed. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954.

An introductory text for the history of the English language with an orientation toward the methods of modern linguistic scholarship.

SLEDD, James. *A Short Introduction to English Grammar*. Chicago, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1958.

An approach to English grammar which intends to be "linguistically honest." Sledd breaks sharply from tradition in some places and gives traditional terms new meanings in others. The glossary (Chapter Seven) sums up important statements made in the first six chapters and attempts to relate them to the schoolroom tradition.

THOMAS, Charles Kenneth. *An Introduction to the Phonetics of American English*. New York: The Ronald Press, 1958.

An extremely clear presentation suitable for use as a textbook in college courses. The exposition of both phonetics and phonemics is commendable for its simplicity, although the simplifications occasionally results in minor misleading statements. On the whole, however, the book is sound theoretically, with excellent chapters on regional variations in American pronunciation, dialect geography, and standard pronunciation.

TRAGER, George L. and Henry Lee Smith, Jr. *An Outline of English Structure*. Norman, Oklahoma: Bottenberg Press, 1951.

Pages 1-52 of this famous little book contain one of the most complete, if controversial, accounts of the comparative phonology of American English with nine vowels /i, e, æ, ɨ, a, ə̧, u, o, o/, three semi-vowels /y, w, h/, four degrees of pitch, four degrees of loudness, and four junctures. There is a concise statement of English morphemics and phonological syntax.

WHITEHALL, Harold. *Structural Essentials of English*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1951.

A brief readable outline of the structure of English based on the analysis of Fries, and a good introduction to the subject.

BAILEY, Beryl L. *Jamaican Creole Syntax: A Transformational Approach*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

One of the values of this book is that it is written by a native speaker of Jamaican Creole with advanced training in linguistics. Thus we are assured that the relationships of the Creole to the Standard are well understood and that the linguistic treatment is sound. She deals with the origins of Creole, and its phonology, morphology, and syntax.

CASSIDY, Frederic G. *Jamaica Talk: Three Hundred Years of the English Language in Jamaica*. London: Macmillan & Co., 1961.

This book, which gives an account of the background and present status of the language of Jamaicans, is recommended for those readers who are interested in Jamaica or in language. It contains an examination of all the elements of Jamaica Talk--pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary.

McINTOSH, Angus. *Introduction to a Survey of Scottish Dialects*. University of Edinburgh Linguistic Survey of Scotland Monographs, No. 1. Edinburgh, Scotland: Thomas Nelson and Sons Limited, 1961.

A discussion of the aims of dialect study, a justification for its pursuit, and an introductory statement on the methods used in the Scottish Survey, which will use both field records and postal questionnaires. This is the first of a projected series of monographs on the Survey.

General Linguistics

BACH, Emmon. *An Introduction to Transformational Grammar*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

A book with numerous exercises and problems to be worked out by the reader, making it something of a self-teaching tool for learning the principles of transformational grammars. Despite the title, one would do well to read another more simple introduction (perhaps Owen Thomas, *Transformational Grammar and the Teacher of English* or Andreas Koutsoudas, *Writing Transformational Grammars: An Introduction*) before beginning this book.

BLOCH, Bernard and George L. Trager. *Outline of Linguistic Analysis*. Baltimore, Maryland: Linguistic Society of America, 1942 (out of print).

A short outline of structural analysis, positing a phonemic system for English of six simple vowels and three semi-vowels. Although this phonemic analysis is no longer accepted, the book is valid as an outline introduction to structural linguistics.

BLOOMFIELD, Leonard. *Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1933.

Language is perhaps the most influential single work in American linguistics. It is the base on which American descriptive linguistic tradition is built, and its author is credited with turning linguistic study into a science. Although published in 1933, all of *Language* can be read with profit today. It is not an easy book to read for a beginner, but any difficulty lies with the scope of material included, rather than with the manner of presentation. Explanations are uncomplicated, and any introductory text in linguistics or structure of English provides adequate background.

CARROLL, John B. (ed.). *Language, Thought and Reality, Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf.* Cambridge: The M. I. T. Press, 1956.

This collection of Whorf's writings reflects his hypothesis that a people's view of reality is in a large part determined by the structure of their language.

CHOMSKY, Noam. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1957.

In this short book is one of the first statements of the transformationalist conception of language. Chomsky discusses the limitations of phrase structure grammar and the goals of linguistic theory, and then presents samples of English transformations. Transformational theory has been further developed since publication of *Syntactic Structures*, but the book remains valuable as representing the fundamental position of this approach to language study. Because of its stylistic compactness, the book is not for the beginner.

DINNEEN, Francis P., S. J. *An Introduction to General Linguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

A survey of ancient, medieval, and modern theories of linguistics. The author is, perhaps, overly preoccupied with the philosophical opinions of the Scholastics and "Modistae." The book, however, is valuable as a survey of this field and for its full bibliographies.

ELSON, Benjamin F. and Velma B. Pickett. *An Introduction to Morphology and Syntax*. Santa Ana, California: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1965.

A concise, somewhat simplified introductory text in morphology and syntax. The method of syntactic analyses is tagmemic—the-slot-filler approach. The text is designed to be used with a *Laboratory Manual for Morphology and Syntax* by William R. Merrifield, *et al*.

FODOR, Jerry A. and Jerrold J. Katz (eds.). *Structure of Language*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

This series of essays by several authors presents much of the theory of transformational linguistics. It is divided into six sections: Introduction, Linguistic Theory, Grammar, Extensions of Grammar, Semantics, and Psychological Implications.

GLEASON, Harold A., Jr. An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics, rev. ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Introductory textbook for stressing of basic linguistic techniques. It provides an understandable account of most aspects of the subject, using examples from English and other languages, and is especially valuable when used with the Workbook in Descriptive Linguistics by the same author. Much of the book deals with the phonology and grammar of modern English.

GREENBERG, Joseph H. Essays in Linguistics. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

A collection of eight essays by Greenberg of which the last four, on the relation between language and culture, are of special interest to social dialectologists. Of the other essays, two are on methodology of language description and two are on historical linguistics.

HALL, Robert A., Jr. Linguistics and Your Language, 2nd rev. ed. Garden City, N. Y.: Archan Books, Doubleday & Co., 1950.

An easy and readable introduction to linguistics, suitable for use at the high school level.

HAMP, Eric P; Fred W. Householder; Robert Austerlitz. Readings in Linguistics II. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1966.

A companion volume to Joos' Readings in Linguistics I, tracing the development in modern linguistics since 1956. This book is not recommended for those whose knowledge of French or German is inadequate, since only 4 of the 39 articles are in English.

HEFFNER, R-M. S. General Phonetics. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964.

This text is divided into two parts: I. Fundamentals (the physiology and physics of speech); II. The sounds of speech (vowels, consonants, onset and offset phenomena, glides, assimilation, intonation and stress). It can be read profitably by the serious student, with little previous knowledge of phonetics.

HOCKETT, Charles F. A Course in Modern Linguistics. New York: Macmillan Co., 1958.

This book will serve as a good introduction to modern linguistics. Much of the material has been simplified, but not to the point of a careless presentation of subject matter. The author clearly presents the generally accepted facts and principles of the field so that they can be understood by anyone at the college level and above. The book includes chapters which deal extensively with the phonological and grammatical systems of English. Some of the other important areas which are covered are morphology, dialectology and historical linguistics. It does not include the history of linguistics or a detailed survey of the languages of the world. A unique feature is the presence of notes at the end of each chapter. These notes point out significant features in the chapter, and are an invaluable aid to independent study.

HOCKETT, Charles R. "The Origin of Speech," Scientific American, CCIII (1960), 89-96.

An article that makes speculation on the origin of language respectable again. Much information on animal non-verbal communications.

HOENIGSWALD, Henry M. *Language Change and Linguistic Reconstruction*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

The most thorough-going 20th century exposition of the principles of historical linguistics and the methodology of scholarship in this field. This book, however, follows the rigid mathematical approach of Zelling S. Harris and is often difficult to read.

JAKOBSON, Roman and Morris Halle. *Fundamentals of Language*. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1956.

The first part of this book, "Phonology and Phonetics," is a brief statement on distinctive feature analysis of speech. Part 2, "Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbances," is an excellent discussion of aphasia.

JOOS, Martin (ed.). *Readings in Linguistics I: The Development of Descriptive Linguistics in America, 1925-56*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

The most valuable collection of major articles (43) in descriptive linguistics published to date. Included are classic papers, many of which are not readily available, covering American linguistics up to the emergence of generative-transformational studies.

KOUTSOUDAS, Andreas. *Writing Transformational Grammars: An Introduction*. Englewood Cliffs: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

A good introduction to the formulation and organization of generative-transformational rules. Each chapter closes with exercises which require the reader to solve language problems using the principles introduced in the chapter. Answere to the problems are in the back of the book.

LAMB, Sydney M. *Outline of Stratificational Grammar*. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press, 1966.

A clear presentation of stratificational grammar (levels of organization). The exercises are workable, and reinforce the simplicity of the system. The appendix is somewhat difficult to read, but provides the results of a stratificational grammar of a limited English text. In analyzing language, Lamb deals with six strata: hypophonemic, phonemic, morphemic, lexemic, sememic, and hypersememic, each of which has its own organization (syntax). This analysis differs from other linguistic analyses which usually recognizes only the levels of phonology, morphology, and semantics, all organized in one syntactic system.

LEHMAN, Winfred P. *Historical Linguistics: An Introduction*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.

A readable introduction to all aspects of historical linguistics. Included are expositions of the methods used in historical study of languages, with illustrations and comments on the implications for the field. In addition, the author explains genealogical classification, the study of related languages; typological classification, the study of languages showing similar linguistic features; and glottochronology, the use of statistical methods to date the differentation of related languages. Of special interest to those concerned with dialect study are the chapters on use of dialect materials in historical linguistics and, especially, the chapter on borrowing and the influence of one language or dialect on another.

MANDELBAUM, David G. (ed.). *Culture, Language and Personality: Selected Essays*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1960.

Nine essays from the larger collection *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language, Culture, and Personality*. The first, "Language," is one of the most stimulating articles written on the subject. It is followed by other essays on language, including one on linguistics as a science, which stresses the fact that language, being part of culture, must be studied broadly if linguistics is to be scientific. The second group of essays deals with culture in general. Last is a series on culture and personality.

MERRIFIELD, William R.; Constance M. Naish; Calvin R. Rensch; Gillian Story. *Laboratory Manual for Morphology and Syntax*. Santa Ana, California: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1965.

A collection of 170 problems in morphology and syntax for use with *An Introduction to Morphology and Syntax* by Benjamin F. Elson and Velma B. Pickett. Used with the text, the workbook provides a sound practical course in the two subjects.

NIDA, Eugene A. *Morphology: The Descriptive Analysis of Words*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1946.

A standard text for morphology courses, covering all phases of the study with ample illustrative material and problems designed for the student. The approach in the book is date oriented, stressing various aspects of identification and interpretation of morphemes, for the training of descriptive linguists for field work.

PEDERSON, Holger (Translated by John Webster Spargo). *The Discovery of Language: Linguistic Science in the Nineteenth Century*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1931.

An important survey of early linguistic research in most of the languages of Europe and Asia. It treats historical and comparative linguistics, especially the contributions of such scholars as Rask, Grimm, Verner, and de Saussure.

PIKE, Kenneth L. *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior*. Glendale: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1954-1960.

The theory of tagmemic analysis as it relates to other systems of behavior.

PIKE, Kenneth L. *Phonemics: A Technique for Reducing Languages to Writing*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1947.

Based upon the theory of his 1943 phonetics text, this recapitulates much of that material in Part I; Part II deals with phonemic analysis. Integrated with the text are problems so that the reader may gain experience in phonological description. There is an extensive glossary. It reflects the practical interest of Pike in providing writing systems for pre-literate peoples.

PIKE, Kenneth L. *Phonetics: A Critical Analysis of Phonetic Theory and a Technic for the Practical Description of Sounds*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1943.

An excellent, though difficult, book on articulatory phonetic theory, in which the author fully explores the possibilities of the physiological mechanisms of speech production.

ROBINS, R. H. *General Linguistics: An Introductory Survey*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1964.

An explanation of the London, or Firthian, school of linguistics, as well as a good introduction to linguistics in general, including acoustic phonetics, transformational grammar, and tagmemics.

SAPIR, Edward. *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1921.

This book, like Bloomfield's *Language*, is one of the classics in linguistics. There are excellent discussions of patterning as found in phonological, morphological, and syntactic analyses. Also outstanding are the chapters on change and on the influences that languages have on each other. Sapir proposes a typological classification of languages, based on the manner in which a language handles material content and relation of concepts.

de SAUSSURE, Ferdinand. (Edited by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye, in collaboration with Albert Reidlinger; translated by Wade Baskin). *Course in General Linguistics*. London, England: Peter Owen Ltd., 1959.

This translation from the French makes available to English speakers the teachings of the European linguist who most influenced American linguistics development. The book covers general principles, making a distinction between synchronic and diachronic linguistics, which was de Saussure's major contribution to the field. He also discusses the principles of geographical linguistics.

STURTEVANT, Edgar H. *An Introduction to Linguistic Science*. New Haven, Connecicutt: Yale University Press, 1947.

An introductory text with strong emphasis on historical linguistics and the origins of changes in language. Dialect geography and borrowing are also discussed, as are sound laws and the relation of writing to speech.

WATERMAN, John T. *Perspectives in Linguistics*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

A good short history of linguistics (105 pp.). Traces major linguistic advances from the Book of Genesis to the 1950's, with examples and evaluations. The author has successfully integrated the names, the ideas, and the movements in linguistics.

Glossaries

HAMP, Eric P. *A Glossary of American Technical Linguistic Usage*, 2nd ed., Utrecht and Antwerp: Spectrum, 1963.

PERI, Mario. *Glossary of Linguistic Terminology*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Linguistics and the Teaching of English

BROOKS, Charlotte K. and William A. Stewart (eds.). "Some Approaches to Teaching English as a Second Language," *Non-Standard Speech and the Teaching of English*. Language Information Series-2, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1964.

A distinct difference is observed between the culturally deprived and the culturally different. The culturally different are the children who are immigrants from foreign lands, and many of whom are non-English speaking. Still others are pupils with physical or emotional problems, or pupils from other English speaking countries. The culturally deprived are, essentially, the children who have been isolated from those rich experiences that should be theirs. This isolation may have been brought about by poverty, by meagerness of intellectual resources in the home and surroundings, by the incapacity, illiteracy, or indifference of elders or of the entire community. The author's two main assumptions are: (1) Standard English should and can be taught as though it were a second language to children who speak non-standard English as a result of cultural differences, cultural deprivation, or both; (2) If standard English is taught as a second language, it is not necessary to insist that the child reject entirely the other or "first" language.

CORBIN, Richard and Muriel Crosby (co-chairmen). Language Programs for the Disadvantaged: Report of the NCTE Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged, 1965.

This book is in several parts: (1) the Task Force and the problem, (2) programs for the disadvantaged (preschool, elementary, secondary, and adult), (3) findings, (4) points of view, (5) recommendations, and (6) appendices. The articles on sustained program of language learning by Walter Loban and social dialects and the disadvantaged by Lee A. Pederson, are of special interest, as are the general recommendations of the Task Force. The appendices offer annotated selected references and an index to programs, projects, and participating schools.

FRIES, Charles Carpenter. Linguistics and Reading. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

A survey in non-technical terms of the views of the nature of language unexpectedly resulting from procedures used by linguists. The main emphasis, according to Fries, should be on "habit-forming practice," based on the assumption "that any child can learn to read within a year after he has learned to 'talk' his native language satisfactorily."

GORDON, Ruth I. Improving Patterns of Language Usage. Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University Press, 1960.

To combat the social and vocational disadvantages experienced by high school students who had recently moved from the South to Detroit, the author has developed techniques for improving their English language usage. She tabulates non-standard forms used by such students, then suggests ways for improvement. Group influence, as opposed to individual tutoring, is recognized and made use of. Remedial lessons and exercises are also included.

HOLBROOK, David. English for the Rejected: Training Literacy in the Lower Streams of the Secondary School. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

An analysis of the education of "lower stream" (least talented academically) British students, abounding with original ideas for motivating such students. Throughout the text, there runs a justifiable condemnation of an educational system that retards the intellectual development of lower stream children.

HURST, Charles., Jr. and Wallace L. Jones. "Psychosocial Concomitants of Sub-Standard Speech," Journal of Negro Education. (Fall, 1966), 409-421.

The development of more productive programs for improving verbal and coping skills is dependent in part on increasing present knowledge of socio-economic causal factors, effects of segregation and discrimination on the personality, relationship of deviate personality traits and limited verbal proficiency, significant psychological factors and the combinations of factors which form the single problem represented by culturally and educationally deprived youth. This study attempted to correlate certain variables--psychological, sociological, and attitudinal--to the levels of speech proficiency (low, medium, high) of Negro college students. When 1209 Negro college freshmen were tested for these variables, it was found that the high-proficiency group tended to come from families resembling middle-class white Americans, with at least one parent who was a professional and a combined family income above $15,000 per year.

JONES, Allen (ed.). Language Teaching, Linguistics, and the Teaching of English in a Multilingual Society. Kingston, Jamaica: University of the West Indies Faculty of Education, 1965.

Included are the proceedings of the Conference on Linguistics and Language Teaching in a Multilingual Society, April 6-9, 1964, during which both basic problems and needs and specific research projects were discussed. There are also reports on major errors made by elementary and secondary school children, with particular emphasis on difficulties with verb usage.

LIN, San-su C. Pattern Practice in the Teaching of English to Students with a Non-Standard Dialect. New York, N. Y.: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965.

The objectives of cooperative research (USOE) project at Claflin College, Orangeburg, South Carolina, which has an all-Negro student body, were to find out to what extent pattern practice techniques could help non-standard speakers master standard English. This was a three-year program, September, 1961, to June, 1964, with 65-70 freshmen (all Negroes) selected each year to be placed in four project sections. Their course met three times a week for 50 minutes, and, in addition, they spent 50 minutes per day in the language laboratory. Pattern practices, based on the types of non-standard patterns used by the students, helped students improve control over standard English, but students could not establish firm control in nine months. The study points up the difficulties encountered in establishing effective programs and the lack of adequate evaluation instruments.

MARCKWARDT, Albert H. Linguistics and the Teaching of English. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1966.

An outline of the contributions of linguistics to the English curriculum which demonstrates that, while there is no one "linguistic method" of teaching English grammar, composition, literature, etc., there are numerous linguistic techniques which, nonetheless, may be brought to bear on problems in these areas.

McDAVID, Raven I., Jr. "Dialectology and the Classroom Teacher," College English, XXIII, (1962), 111-116.

This article provides an overall introduction to dialectology by defining the term and by giving some idea of studies completed as well as areas still neglected. It also gives examples of some typical situations in which a knowledge of dialectology or dialect differences would help one to recognize the problems and deal with them better.

QUIRK, Randolph and A. H. Smith (eds.). The Teaching of English. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

A series of papers dealing with the applications of structural linguistics to school English programs. The linguistic approaches in speech and English classes, as well as in the teaching of English as a foreign language.

SMITH, Henry Lee, Jr. *Linguistic Science and the Teaching of English*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1956.

This has much of the material found in the *Outline of English Structure* but in a much more readable form. Recommended for beginners in studying stress and sentence intonation, and for its tips to teachers for helping children to recognize significant vowel contrasts.

Paralanguage and Non-Verbal Communication

AUSTIN, William M. "Some Social Aspects of Paralanguage," *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, XI (1965), 31-39.

This account of paralanguage differs somewhat from that of Trager and offers some examples of comparative paralanguage. There is a text of American Negro speech with Austin's own paralinguistic notation.

BIRDWHISTELL, Ray L. "Some Relations between American Kinesics and Spoken American English," in Alfred Y. Smith (ed.), *Communication and Culture*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966, pp. 182-189.

A study of relationships between verbal and kinesic markers. Valuable material, but not for the beginner.

BIRDWHISTELL, Ray L. "Kinesics," Chapter 3 in Norman A. McQuown, *The Natural History of an Interview*, (in preparation), 1967.

Birdwhistell's best statement on kinesics. Includes a detailed analysis of the kinesics of two GI hitch-hikers.

BIRDWHISTELL, Ray L. *Introduction to Kinesics*. Foreign Service Institute, Department of State (1952).

This is not a comprehensive introduction, as the title might suggest, but a detailed discussion and outline of a notation.

CRITCHLEY, MacDonald. *The Language of Gesture*. New York: Longman's Green, 1939.
Much of sundry information on gesture, but this is not a system-oriented approach, such as that by Hall (*The Silent Language*) or Birdwhistell (*Kinesics*).

DARWIN, Charles. *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*. John Murray, London (1872), Reprinted D. Appleton & Co., New York, 1898.

A little-known work by Darwin, of great historical interest but lacking in the disciplinary framework of present-day investigators.

EFRON, David. *Gesture and Environment*. New York: King's Crown Press, 1941.

This book describes aspects of the gestural behavior of Eastern Jews and Southern Italians in New York City, including illustrations and discussion of general principles.

FRANK, Lawrence K. "Tactile Communications," *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, LVI (1957), 209-255. In *Communication and Culture*, *q. v.*, Smith, Alfred Y. (ed.), New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

This article is more concerned with the biology and psychology of haptice rather than with its communicative aspects. Some remarks on babies and tactility. Good background material.

GUMPERZ, John J. "Dialect Difference and Social Stratification in a North Indian Village," *American Anthropologist*, LX (1958), 668-682.

The caste system of Khalapur is mirrored in the phonology of the different caste dialects within the village.

HALDANE, J. B. S. "Animal Communications and the Origin of Human Language," *Science Progress*, XLIII (1955), 385-401.

Some provocative, but not totally convincing, speculations on the relations of animal and human communications. A Darwinian approach.

HALL, Edward T. *The Hidden Dimension*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1966.

This is a book about man's unconscious structuring of microspace, (the study of which the author names "proxemics") about how different cultures use space, and about the biological bases of sight. It is a valuable statement on perception, made especially valuable by the author's application of his ideas to the analysis of the visual aspects of literature as well as of the visual arts of different periods.

HALL, Edward T. *The Silent Language*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1959.

Communication has three aspects: its overall structure, its components, and the message itself. The last can be divided into three parts: Sets (e.g., words), isolates (e.g., sounds), and patterns (e.g., grammar or syntax). The author argues that all systems of a culture (not the spoken language alone) communicate; indeed, environment communicates. This fact becomes most evident in cross-cultural situations, in which the persons involved bring to the encounters different cultural "programming;" such encounters result in misinterpretation and misunderstanding. Included is a presentation of the system for analysis of culture which uses a linguistic model developed by the author and George L. Trager.

HALL, Edward T. "A System for Notation of Proxemic Behavior," *American Anthropologist*, LXV (1963), 1003-1025.

This is a original publication of proxemics (Hall's term for the study of microspace as a system of bio-communication). In it, Hall presents a review of the literature of non-verbal communication pertinent to the study of man's communication by his use of space and gives his system of notation in detail. He reports some findings from studies using the system to examine structuring of space in different cultures (e.g., Arabs as a group stand much closer to each other than do Northern Europeans). A sample of a recorded transaction is included.

LaBARRE, Weston. "The Cultural Basis of Emotions and Gestures," *Journal of Personality*, (1947), 49-68.

A rather amusing comparison of certain gestures used in different cultures. For example, we nod the head to signify affirmation, but the Ainu of northern Japan slowly bring both hands to the chest and then slowly wave them downward, palms up.

SMITH, Alfred Y. (ed.). *Communication and Culture*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

A comprehensive collection of essays by experts in social psychology, mathematical theory of communication, and linguistic anthropology, all dealing with the theory of communication as it relates to their fields.

SMITH, Henry Lee, Jr. "An Outline of Metalinguistic Analysis," _Report of the Third Annual Round Table Conference on Linguistics and Language Study, Georgetown Monograph Series_ (1952).

Based on an earlier survey mimeographed by the Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State, this is the first modern linguistic statement on paralanguage.

TRAGER, George L. "Paralanguage: A First Approximation," _Studies in Linguistics_, XIII (1958), 1-12.

Trager's most complete statement on paralanguage to date, bearing the author's characteristically individual viewpoint. After surveying previous research, Trager introduces new variables and presents a notational system to deal with the problem. Though not recommended for the beginner, this is a _sine quo non_ for future research in the area.

TRAGER, George L. "Taos III: Paralanguage," _Anthropological Linguistics_ (1960), 24-30.

The only paralinguistic study of an American Indian language, and also one of the few paralinguistic studies of a language other than English. Not for beginners.

Psycholinguistics and Sociolinguistics

BRAM, Joseph. _Language and Society_. New York: Random House, 1955.

A valuable summary of language study and the place of language in culture. Included are chapters on the nature of language, the disciplines concerned with its study (e.g., lexicography, grammar, etymology, philology, and comparative linguistics), its place in socialization and enculturation, language change, social organization and language (e.g., kinship), and language and national images.

BRIGHT, William (ed.). _Sociolinguistics: Proceedings of the UCLA Socio-Linguistics Conference_, 1964. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1966.

Sixteen papers presented by the participants of the UCLA Conference on Sociolinguistics May 11-13, 1964, with the discussions of each contribution. Three of these, "The Dimension of Sociolinguistics" (William Bright), "Hypercorrection by the Lower Middle Class as a Factor in Linguistic Change" (William Labov), and "Dialect Differences and Social Differences in an Urban Society" (Raven I. McDavid, Jr.), are especially useful to those interested in the preparation of English teachers.

CAPELL, A. _Studies in Socio-Linguistics_. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1966.

In this book is discussed the possibility of a sociolinguistic theory that could lead to a "unified theory of human behavior," as postulated by Kenneth Pike (_Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior_), which the author concludes is valid insofar as there are parallels between linguistic and nonlinguistic social events. A second section is concerned with social change and linguistic acculturation. The role of language in society, including literary form comprises the final section of the book.

"Color and Race," Daedalus, XCUI, No. 2, Spring, 1967.

Discussions of the role of color and race relations in many parts of the world (e.g., America, England, Central and South America, West Indies, India and Japan). The psychology of color identity also is discussed in several papers.

DANCE, Frank E. X. (ed.). Human Communication Theory: Original Essays. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

The essays in this volume are designed to describe, rather than evaluate, the current state of human communication theory from the standpoints of the various disciplines which the contributors represent. There is an extensive bibliography of recent works on symbolic analysis that relate form to social content. The essays by Dell Hymes, Jerry A. Fodor, James J. Jenkins, Sol Saporta, and Frank E. X. Dance will be of particular interest to linguists.

FISHMAN, Joshua A. Language Loyalty in the United States: The Maintenance and Perpetuation of Non-English Mother Tongues by American Ethnic and Religious Groups. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1966.

A comprehensive study of how various foreign languages have fared in the New World. There are especially good treatments of the histories of German, French, Spanish and Ukrainian in the U. S., but there is very little discussion of oriental languages, owing to the lack of data at the author's disposal. The cultural implications of maintenance of a non-English mother tongue, from church-centered language efforts to foreign language broadcasting, is discussed at length.

HALL, Edward T. and George L. Trager. The Analysis of Culture. Washington, D. C.: American Council of Learned Societies, 1953 (out of print).

An application of a linguistic model to the analysis of culture, this theoretical paper presents a system that recognizes that man's culture is biologically based. The methodology set forth requires the identification of the basic systems of the culture and their basic units, then the identification of the ways these systems integrate at various levels. A less specialized presentation of these ideas is found in Edward T. Hall's The Silent Language.

HOCKETT, Charles R. "Animal Language and Human Language," in J. N. Spuhler (ed.), The Evolution of Man's Capacity for Culture. Detroit, 1959.

Some basic information for those who think animal "language" differs from human language in degree rather than kind.

McQUOWN, Norman A. "Linguistic Transcription and Specification of Psychiatric Interview Materials," Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes, XX, No. 1, (1967), 78-86.

This is an attempt to use the descriptive techniques of linguistics to afford an independent avenue for confirming or revising the psychiatrist's intuitions during a psychiatric interview. The author outlines the methods description and analysis he uses, and gives examples of his linguistic, paralinguistic, and semantic observations. Included are profiles of the analyst and the patient, with supporting evidence cited from the data.

McQUOWN, Norman A. The Natural History of an Interview (in preparation 1967).

A book similar in intent to The First Five Minutes (Pittenger, Hockett, and Danchy) but much larger in scope as well as in detail. Contains a detailed and exhaustive linguistic, paralinguistic, and kinesic score for a psychiatric interview that is more complicated than the score for a symphony orchestra.

PITTENGER, Robert E.; Charles F. Hockett; John J. Danchy. The First Five Minutes. Ithaca, N. Y.: Paul Martineau, 1960.

This is a fascinating book for those interested in a linguistic and paralinguistic approach to psychiatry. Chapter II (pp. 185-206) contains Hockett's transcription and paralinguistic framework.

PITTENGER, Robert E. and Henry Lee Smith, Jr. "A Basis for Some Contributions of Linguistics to Psychiatry," Psychiatry, XX (1957), 61-78. Also in Alfred Y. Smith (ed.) Communication and Culture. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

This contains many of the basic concepts of stress, pitch, paralanguage, and kinesics and suggests some wider applications.

SEBEOK, Thomas A; Alfred S. Hayes; Mary Catherine Bateson. Approaches to Semiotics: Transactions of the Indiana Conference on Paralinguistics and Kinesics. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1964

Report on a conference concerned with the total process of communication. Includes articles on the anthropological, linguistic, psychiatric, and educational aspects of communication.

Research in Progress

BEREITER, Carl; Jean Osborn; Siegfried Englemann, Philip A. Reidford. "Acceleration of Intellectual Development in Early Childhood (An Academically-Oriented Preschool For Culturally Deprived Children)," Institute for Research on Exceptional Children: University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

CLARK, Dennis; Abraham Wolf; Murray Halfond; Henry Goehl; Donald Ecroyd; William Labov. "The Dialect Remediation Project of Temple University-Berean Institute," Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

DEUTSCH, Martin, et al. "Long-Range Investigation of the Developmental, Psychological and Social Determinants of Learning and Intelligence, with Particular Emphasis on the Role of Environmental Influences," Institute for Developmental Studies, Department of Psychiatry: New York Medical College.

DILLARD, J. L. "The Urban Language Study of the Center for Applied Linguistics," The Linguistic Reporter, VIII, No. 5 (October, 1966), 1-2.

EDDINGTON, Neil. Title Unknown. Department of Anthropology: University of California at Berkeley.

ENTWISLE, Doris R. "Analytic Studies of Children's Word Associations," Department of Electrical Engineering: Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

FRANCIS, Nelson W.; Beryl Bailey; Robert Maskill. "Preparation of Materials and Course of Study for Improving the Command of Standard English of Entering Freshmen at Tougaloo College, Mississippi," Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.

HALL, Edward T. "Ethnic Use of Micro-Space in Interpersonal Encounters," Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois.

HAYES, Alfred S.; William Nemser; William A. Stewart; William Carroll; Anita Friedman. "District of Columbia Urban Language Study," Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D. C.

HURST, Charles. "Identification of Psychological Correlates of Dialectolalia," Department of Speech: Howard University, Washington, D. C.

LIN, San-su C. "Pattern Practice in the Teaching of Standard English to Students with a Non-Standard Dialect," Department of English: Southern University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana (work done at Claflin College, Orangeburg, North Carolina).

LAURENCE, Caroline. "Study of Standard Dialect of Negro College Students," Center for Research in Language and Language Behavior: University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

LOTT, Marilyn. Title Unknown. Department of Linguistics: University of California at Berkeley.

MORIN, Shirley; Roanld Midkiff. "Some Evidence for Teaching English as a Second Dialect," Burrillville High School, Harrisville, Rhode Island, and Rome City Schools, Georgia.

OSSER, Harry. "Speech Development in Children with Emphasis on the Development of Syntax in Urban Children who Speak a Non-Standard Dialect," Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, Maryland.

RIEGEL, Klaus F.; Edwin J. Martin. "Development of Language Functions: Developmental Studies in Semantics," Center for Human Growth and Development, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

RUMERY, June. "A Comparison of Some Grammatical Aspects of Non-Standard and Standard English," Department of Linguistics, University of California at Berkeley.

WILLIAMSON, Juanita. "A Study of the Speech of Negro High School Students in Memphis," Department of English, LeMoyne College, Memphis, Tennessee.

Current Social Dialect Research at American Higher Institutions. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics and the National Council of Teachers of English.

The Center for Applied Linguistics and the National Council of Teachers of English have cooperated in forming the Clearing House for Social Dialect Studies to regularly issue summaries of current research in the field. For information, write Roger Shuy, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1717 Massachusetts Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

Selected Articles from Language Learning

The following specially recommended articles are from Selected Articles from Language Learning, I and II, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1953, 1963. Articles published in Language Learning are limited to those that deal with descriptive rather than historical linguistics, are based on or consistent with the findings of linguistic science, and contribute to the improvements of foreign language learning and teaching. Generally, the articles provide sound theory and practice in a form that can be easily understood by readers with limited linguistic training. Includes book reviews, editorials, and announcements. The articles are listed by author, title, the volume of Selected Articles in which they appear, and page reference.

ANTHONY, Ann. "Tools for Teaching Pronunication," I, 131-134.

BUELL, Maxine Guin. "Picture Exercises for Oral Drill of Structure Patterns," I, 96-115.

DYKSTRA, Gerald. "Teach Grammar," I, 83-86.

FRENCH, Virginia. "'Do I Do That?' A Suggested Check List for Teachers of English as a Second Language," I, 46-50.

FRIES, Charles C. "As We See It," I, 35-39.

LADO, Robert. "Maintaining Interest," I, 59-61.

____________. "Materials and Tests in English as a Foreign Language: A Survey," II, 31-37.

____________. "Pattern Practice--Completely Oral," I, 42-45.

____________. "Teaching General American r to Spanish Speaking Students," I, 141-146.

____________. "Testing Control of the Structure of a Foreign Language," I, 193-211.

McINTOSH, Lois. "Linguistic Science and the Practical World," I, 33-34.

REED, David W.; Robert Lado; and Yao Shen. "The Importance of the Native Language in Foreign Language Learning," I, 17-23.

REED, David W. "The Nature of Language," I, 11-12.

SHEN, Yao. "Are You Missing a Contrast?" I, 40-41.

WALLACE, Betty J. "The Importance of Classroom Atmosphere," I, 62-64.

WALLACE, Betty J. "Pronunciation as a Two-fold Process," I, 128-130.

Teaching English as a Foreign Language

ALLEN, Robert L.; Virginia French Allen; Margaret Shute. *English Sounds and Their Spelling*. New York: Thomas Crowell Company, 1966.

The exercises on the right-hand pages and the directions and explanations on the left-hand pages are designed to teach the regular correspondences between a sound and its spelling, and spelling patterns and their sounds. No system of transcription is used, and the teacher must act as model. Could be used effectively in both class and tutorial work as a spelling book.

ALLEN, Robert L. and Virginia French Allen. *Listen and Guess*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

The series provides practice in understanding spoken English. The written exercises are simple and could be done orally instead. These materials could be used as supplementary self-help or tutorial practice, with any American (perhaps another student) acting as guide. Vocabulary and grammatical structures controlled. Three laboratory books, a teacher's manual, tapes, and records are included.

BAUMWOLL, Dennis and Robert L. Saitz. "Advanced Reading and Writing," *Exercises in English as a Second Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Fairly difficult reading passages are followed by glossaries and editor's comments. Vocabulary and preposition exercises are useful. The oral and written exercises are not controlled. Could be most effectively used in a class with mixed language background.

BENARDO, Leo U. and Dora F. Pantell. *English: Your New Language*. Morristown, N. J.: Silver Burdett Company, 1966.

This classroom text presents English through functional situations, including dialogues, pattern practice and pronunciation drills. No transcription is used, though stress and intonation are presented in a system of dots. The teacher's edition lists grammatical points, vocabulary, and gives directions for use. Most of the work is oral, though some writing practice is included.

CORNELIUS, Edwin T., Jr. *Teaching English: A Practical Guide for Teachers of English as a Foreign Language*. Washington Publications, 3915 Military Road, N. W., Washington, D. C., 1955.

A linguistically oriented but completely non-technical introduction. "The thesis of this manual is that the greatest difficulties encountered by the teacher of English as a second language are not problems of choosing methods or textbooks at all, but rather, problems which arise out of the teacher's attitude toward language and toward the principles of language learning." Content includes objectives of the teacher, techniques of teaching, problems encountered, equipment, and teacher preparation.

CROWELL, Thomas Lee, Jr. *Index to Modern English*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Ideal student reference grammar for the foreign student, characterized by clear, simple statements and an abundance of examples. Exercises in *Advanced English Exercises* (Fuller and Wasell) and *Mastering American English* (Taylor) are cross-referenced in the *Index*.

DIXSON, Robert J. *Oral Pattern Drills in Fundamental English*. New York: Regents Publishing Company, 1963.

This lab manual consists of transformation drills mostly on verbs and nouns (singular to plural, present to past, etc.). Some of the 72 drills provide convenient supplementary work on simple manipulations in English both in class and for individual work.

Drills and Exercises in English Pronunciation: Consonants and Vowels. Washington, D. C.: Collier-Macmillan International, 1967.

This series, with the tapes, presents drills on individual sounds and groups of sounds that cause difficulty to the learner of English. These are notes on spelling and pronunciation which may need some clarification, and some drills which may require evaluation by the teacher. The texts and tapes may be used for guided self-help in improving and correcting pronunciation. (A partial use of a modified Trager/Smith transcription; intonation by lines on a scale.)

FINOCCHIARO, Mary. *Selections for Developing English Language Skills*. New York: Regents Publishing Co., 1966.

Designed for use in testing English as a foreign language "at any school level from upper elementary school through college, at beginning and intermediate levels of language learning," this text contains 155 short selections (4 to 27 lines) presented in two sections: I. Selections for Listening Comprehension (100), II. Selections for Reading Comprehension (55). The selections for listening comprehension "can be introduced as soon as students have acquired a reasonable listening and speaking vocabulary, whether or not they have learned to read and write." The selections from both sections "can also be used for dictation, for listening comprehension followed by either oral or written questions, or for reading comprehension...an attempt has been made to grade the material from shorter and simpler passages to longer and more complex ones." Each selection is followed by multiple choice questions for which a key is provided at the back of the book. The preface for teachers contains an outline of procedures and 14 suggested "related activities for further intensive practice."

FRIES, Charles C. *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1945.

A pioneer American work in this field, this book is linguistic in orientation and non-technical in presentation. It explains the principles underlying the selection, sequence, and use of materials developed at the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan, specifically in its Intensive Course in English for Latin American Students, and provides considerable detail of the content of these materials by way of illustration. The central chapters of the book develop Fries' oft-quoted statement, "The most efficient materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with the parallel description of the native language of the learner. It is not enough simply to have the results of such a thorough-going analysis; these results must be organized into a satisfactory system for teaching and implemented with adequate specific practice materials through which the learner may master the sound system, the structure, and the most useful lexical materials of the foreign language." (page 9). Emphasizes the "oral approach" and the goal of "production as an automatic unconscious habit." The exceptionally helpful appendix contains (1) Step-by-Step Procedure in Marking Limited Intonation, (2) Sample Lesson Materials from the Beginners' Text, *Ingles por Practica*, designed for use in courses in which pronunciation, structure, and vocabulary are taught in a single class hour, (3) Outlines of Materials of *An Intensive Course in English for Latin Americans: Pronunciation, Grammar, and Vocabulary*.

HALL, Eugene J. Practical Conversation in English for Intermediate Students. New York: Regents Publishing Company, 1965.

Oral approach text based on situational dialogues with some written exercises. A variety of drill types for class or tutorial work. No systemactic work on pronunciation, though there are some drills on stress (indicated by accent marks) and intonation (marked with lines on the sentences). Grammatical explanations are often in the form of rules, and sometimes require supplementary explanations by the teacher.

HALLIDAY, M. A. K., Angus McIntosh, and Peter Strevens. The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1964.

The authors deal with problems that teachers of foreign languages, especially teachers of English as a foreign language, have, and try to bridge the gap between the newly acquired theory and knowledge of language and the practical problems of teaching the language. They first present a section on linguistic science and its tools (phonetics, description, uses and users of language, and translation). In the second part of the book they apply the theory of Part I to problems of teaching. The book also deals with the role of linguistics and phonetics in language teaching, and suggests programs for teaching English as a native language and for teaching English as a foreign language.

KANE, John and Mary Kirkland. Contemporary Spoken English. New York: Thomas Crowell Company, 1967.

The several books that make up this series concentrate on oral English, with an abundance of rhythm, intonation, and minimal pair drills. Intonation is marked by lines; stress by a system of dots. There is a limited use of a modified Trager/Smith transcription. Unfortunately, the pronunciation drills are not graded, nor are they indexed. The grammatical exercises provide an abundance of transformation, question-answer, and substitution drills. The grammatical explanations are graphic and clear. Unfortunately, there are many typographical errors that might lead to misunderstandings. The books could be most effectively used with a class, or as a supplement to provide additional drills on difficult points.

KAPLAN, Robert B. Reading and Rhetoric. New York: The Odyssey Press, 1963.

Fairly difficult reading passages are followed by vocabulary exercises and questions for analysis of the passages. Most effectively used as a reading supplement for the tutorial student. The Appendix adds a brief history of the English language.

LADO, Robert. Language Testing: The Construction and Use of Foreign Language Tests. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

For linguists, for teachers of foreign languages, especially teachers of English as a foreign language, and for research workers in language learning and teaching, this book provides a non-technical introduction to the theory and practice of language testing. No background in statistics is required for an understanding of these techniques; the necessary statistical procedures are outlined. The book is divided into five parts: Part I treats the theory of language testing; Part II covers techniques for testing student' pronunciation, intonation, stress, grammatical structures, and vocabulary; Part III includes materials on testing auditory comprehension, reading, writing, speaking, and translation; Part IV discusses cultural implications; and Part V discusses the refining of language tests and statistical techniques for this task.

LADO, Robert. *Linguistics Across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1957.

A non-technical introduction to contrastive analysis in foreign language teaching. Deals with "the comparison of any two languages and cultures to discover and describe the problems that the speakers of one of the languages will have in learning the other." Draws mainly upon contrasts between English and Spanish as they apply to the diagnosis of learning difficulties, the preparation of new and supplementary materials, and the evaluation of the language and culture content of textbooks and tests. Contains a foreword by Charles C. Fries; discussion of the necessity for systematic comparison of languages and cultures; comparison of sound systems, grammatical structures, vocabulary systems, writing systems, and cultures; a table of phonetic and phonemic symbols; general bibliographical information and a selected bibliography (part II on specific languages and contrastive studies thereof) with explanatory notes and annotations.

LANE, Harlan. "Programmed Learning of a Second Language," *Sonderdruk aus IRAL*, II, No. 4, Nov., 1964, 249-301.

The findings of linguistic science codify group norms for verbal behavior, and this provides the acceptable forms and sequences of responses to be programmed. This article discusses theories of learning, types of programs, and various machine tools applicable to language learning.

LEFEVRE, Helen and Carl A. Lefevre. *Writing by Patterns*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.

Sentence analysis, fill-in-the-blanks, and writing by model are characteristic exercises. There is no guide to lexical compatibility, and, in that sense, the exercises are not controlled. The aim is more at writing well—formed sentences than at composition.

MACNAMARA, John. *Bilingualism and Primary Education: A Study of Irish Experience*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press, 1966.

The title of this book is somewhat misleading. This work is primarily a report on the efforts of a government to create a bilingual and bicultural nation, and it is not a description of problems encountered in the education of bilingual children. Once one understands this perspective, he will find the book valuable as a detailed examination of this attempt in Ireland, with obvious implications for education in other countries. The effort to create a bilingual and bicultural nation has not succeeded in Ireland and, as desirable as the ideal may seem, the author regrets the damage brought on the Irish child's education by a somewhat unrealistic policy of biculturalism. Unless better methods of implementing this policy are developed, however, the children will continue to be educationally handicapped.

NEWMARK, Leonard; Jerome Mintz; and Jan Ann Lawson. *Using American English*. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Part one consists of dialogues and dialogue variations. Intonation is marked by a system of dots and arrows. There is no systematic presentation of any feature of the language except vocabulary, which is excellently presented in situational dialogues. Part two consists of reading passages and partial paraphrasing; again, primarily a vocabulary exercise. These exercises provide convenient supplementary reading-vocabulary building for the tutorial student.

NICHOLS, Ann Eljenholm. *English Syntax: Advanced Composition for Non-Native Speakers*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

More of a grammar review than a composition book. The exercises do not lend themselves to oral work. They could be used effectively in class or tutorially. Both grammatical explanations and directions to the student may need clarification.

PLAISTER, Ted. *English Monosyllables: A Minimal Pair Locator List for Teaching English as a Second Language*. Honolulu, Hawaii: East-West Center Press, 1965. Available from Publications Section, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1717 Massachusetts Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

As the author explains in his introduction, this list of English monosyllables "has been compiled and arranged to facilitate the location of minimal pairs, one of the most useful tools for teaching and testing pronunciation available to the teacher of English as a second language." Entries are arranged first by vowel and then by final consonant(s), since final consonant contrasts cannot be found with an ordinary dictionary, as easily as can initial consonant contrasts. Items with variant pronunciations are listed under both pronunciations, with all pronunciations based on *Webster's Third International Dictionary of the English Language*. An introduction explains the uses of symbols and the organization of items, and an index is included.

ROBERTS, Paul. *English Sentences*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962.

Though this book is intended as an English grammar text for American high school students, it also serves as a self-study or tutorial text for a non-native speaker of English. The terminology is conventional; the explananations and directions are clear and simple, though on occasion, they may require paraphrasing. Many of the exercises could be used effectively as oral classwork.

ROBINSON, Lois. *Guided Writing and Free Writing*. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

The text provides many oral drills for class work. Written exercises could be effectively used for both class and tutorial work. Directions and grammatical explanations are clear and in simple terms.

SAPORTA, Sol. "Problems in the Comparison of the Morphemic Systems of English And Spanish," *Hispania*, XXXIX, 1956, 36-39.

After a brief, simple statement of "some of the assumptions of structural linguistics, particularly as they apply to the problem of foreign-language teaching," the author explains the rationale and nature of contrastive analysis, with an illustrative comparison of the "plural" morphemes of English and Spanish. Although intended for teachers of Spanish to English speakers, the article is almost equally valuable for teachers of English to speakers of Spanish and of other languages.

SHEN, Yao and Ruth H. Crymes. *Teaching English as a Second Language: A Classified Bibliography*. Honolulu, Hawaii: East-West Center Press, 1965.

Compiled "to meet the increasing needs of two programs in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) at the University of Hawaii" (the masters program in the Department of Linguistics and the Teacher Interchange program in the Asian Studies Department), this bibliography is divided into four sections: (1) phonology, (2) grammar, (3) methodology, and (4) titles of journals. The first three sections are topically subclassified; the fourth gives the titles of journals, arranged according to country, with 36 journal titles listed under the U.S.A. Section 3 contains a subclassification for bibliographies. Includes an author index. Available from the Center for Applied Linguistics, 1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

STREVENS, Peter (ed.). Papers in Language and Language Teaching. London: Oxford Univeristy Press, 1965.

An introduction to new ideas, techniques, and equipment used in foreign language teaching. Some of the articles deal specifically with teaching English as a foreign language, but most deal with foreign language teaching in general.

HYMAN, Ruth L. "[ŋ] as an Allophone Denoting Open Juncture in Several Spanish-American Dialects," Hispania, XXXIX (1956), 293-299.

In part a response to Chavarria-Aguilar's interpretation of [ŋ] as a separate phoneme in Costa Rican Spanish (Language XXVII (1951), 248-253), suggesting an alternative interpretation: "[ŋ] remains in complementary distribution within /n/ and is, in fact, an allophone of /n/ serving to mark word boundary when occurring before another word beginning with a vowel. In other words, [ŋ] is an indicator of open juncture." Reviews previous interpretations of [ŋ] and of open juncture and reports the results of a study designed to determine whether [ŋ] occurs "within a phrase or breath group, as well as before a pause" in "other Spanish-American dialects," and whether this distribution fits "the criteria for juncture."

KAHANE, Henry R. and Richard Beym. "Syntactical Juncture in Colloquial Mexican Spanish," Language, XXIV (1948), 388-396.

Reports the results of an attempt to apply objective (phonetic) criteria to the phrase system of Mexican Spanish, to establish the units of Spanish speech (phonic groups) "by means of juncture phenomena," and to define them "in terms of phrase function." Includes (1) five criteria for close juncture that applied to a Mexican woman's oral reading of a Mexican play, (2) an outline of the system of Spanish phrase function, since in Spanish "the phonetic phenomenon of juncture is closely connected with the syntactical phenomenon of phrase function," (3) examples of close juncture as they correspond to the phrase function identified in the outline, (4) conclusions as to "which form-classes of the Spanish language are normally 'run together,'" and relevant comparisons with the findings of Tomas Navarro-Tomas, Manual de entonacion espanola (New York, 1944).

STOCKWELL, Robert P. and Donald J. Bowen. The Sounds of English and Spanish. (Contrastive Structure Series, Charles A. Ferguson, General Editor) Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Part of a series of contrastive structure studies undertaken by the Center for Applied Linguistics through a contract with USOE in 1959 to provide information on "one of the major problems in the learning of a second language--the interference caused by structural differences between the native language of the learner and the second language." Oriented from English to Spanish, as is its companion volume, The Grammatical Structures of English and Spanish, but valuable for teachers of English to Spanish-speaking students. The book is not about teaching methods but "about the sources of the problems that must be faced by any teaching method."

STOCKWELL, Robert P.; Donald J. Bowen; I. Silva-Fuenzalida. "Spanish Juncture and Intonation," Language, XXXII (1956), 641-665.

A highly technical analysis, involving complex theoretical considerations that apply to phonological analysis in general and to phonological analysis of Spanish in particular. It deals with (1) plus juncture, (2) terminal juncture, (3) pitch, (4) stress, (5) intonation patterns and superfixes, (6) "shifts" from normal intonation patterns, and (7) vocalizations (supra-intonational systems). Plus juncture is analyzed as a segmental phoneme.

Teaching Dialogues, English as a New Language Program Adults with Teacher's Guide and Tapes. Board of Education, 1966.

Situational dialogues with intonation lines are followed by question-answer practices. The teacher's guide gives notes on vocabulary, pronunciation, grammar, and pattern practice. Intended for oral class use. The tapes and text could be used as supplementary self-help practice in spoken English, even with younger students.

Teaching English to Puerto Rican Pupils in Grades 1 and 2. Language Guide Series, New York, Board of Education of the City of New York, 1963.

Part of a series of guides developed in connection with a three-year experimental program in grades 1 through 8, initiated in 1954, which "attempted to answer three major questions for each grade." Vocabulary includes such things as furnace, subway, basement, and other terms which are common in N. Y. but not in Puerto Rico, as well as items which are high in beginners' lists. The first patterns are those which are common in both English and Spanish, i.e., "the book is here" and "*El libro esta aqui*," and, of course, those which are different. The main leading situation must be so set up as to make optimum use of pattern practice.

WOLFF, Hans. "Phonemic Structure and the Teaching of Pronunciation," *Language Learning*, VI (1956), 17-23.

In an expansion of "Partial Comparison of the Sound Systems of English and Puerto Rican Spanish," the author emphasizes the nature of a phoneme as "a contrastive unit in a system," related to and distinguished from all other units in the system by certain distinctive features, e.g., voicing, and discusses the theoretical bases for what he calls the two stages (levels) of expected difficulty for Puerto Rican speakers in learning English phonemes.

Using the Language Laboratory

"A Dozen Do's and Don'ts for Planning and Operating a Language Lab or an Electronic Classroom in a High School," New York: Materials Center, Modern Language Association.

This very short pamphlet gives suggestions compiled from those made in two conferences on language laboratory planning. It is a good place to begin if one is contemplating the installation of some sort of language laboratory; for example, the first "Do" is "Do hire a consultant (not employed by a lab equipment manufacturer), to help you plan, evaluate bids, do the final checking of installed equipment."

HAYES, Alfred S. *Language Laboratories Facilities: Technical Guide for the Selection, Purchase, Use, and Maintenance*. (New Media for Instruction 4) No. 37: U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

An excellent short manual for those considering the installation of language laboratory. The book assumes no previous knowledge of technical matters; an important part of its value is the concise introduction to kinds of language laboratories, tape recorders, and associated acoustic equipment, and a glossary of technical terms. Later sections of the book treat pedagogical questions, and the various technical systems and their appropriateness to different language learning situations, testing, purchase, and maintenance.

MATHIEU, G. "The Case for Tapes Without Pauses," *Modern Language Journal*, XLIX (1965), 40-43.

The author argues that tapes that do not have prerecorded pauses offer more versatile teaching tools than do those that do. If the tape is continuous, with only enough silent space between utterances for the teacher or student to catch the end of the stimulus or correct response, the teacher or student can create individual pauses of any length by pushing a pause button or a foot-activated pause lever. In this way, one tape can be converted into several sorts of drills, with pauses inserted in different places and of different lengths.

MORTON, Rand F. "The Teaching Machine and the Teaching of Languages: A Report on Tomorrow," *PMLA*, LXXV, No. 4, Part 2 (1960), 1-6.

Teaching machines are an extension of the teacher. Their programs, which are written by teachers, exploit the same basic theories of the learning process that the teacher does: (1) The subject to be taught must be capable of verbal or graphic representation, (2) The learning procedure used is "step-increment" learning, (3) Each step (problem and answer) must be of minimal nature and assume no knowledge on the part of the student other than that gained in preceding steps, (4) Progress through the program must be controlled.

STACK, Edward M. *The Language Laboratory and Modern Language Teaching* (revised edition). New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

A text on the teaching methods and the administrative and mechanical procedures relating to the operation of a language laboratory. The author recognizes that concentration either on reading and writing or on audio-lingual skills will lead to a lopsided accomplishment. Thus, the language laboratory should complement more traditional methods of foreign language teaching, but it can never totally supplant the traditional practice of reading and writing. The book discusses the different sorts of language laboratories (broadcast, library, and combination), their construction and installation, and their administration, as well as the design of exercises, drills, and tests appropriate for laboratory teaching.